

VIZAGAPATAM DISTRICT

1769-1834

A HISTORY OF THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE
ZAMINDARS AND THE EAST INDIA COMPANY

M. S. R. ANJANEYULU



Copies : 500

March, 1982

Ac No

133

© ANDHRA UNIVERSITY

SERIES No. 172

PRICE : Rs. 46-00



Printed at the Aquarian Printing School, Visakhapatnam and
Published by the Director, Andhra University Press &
Publications, Waltair, Visakhapatnam-530 003.

CONTENTS

Foreword	i
Preface	v
Abbreviations	vii
I Introduction	1
II From the Foundation of Vizagapatam Settlement to the Establishment of the Company's Authority in the District (1682-1769)	13
III Company's Administration in Vizagapatam (1769-1835)	33
IV The Vizianagaram Zamindari	82
V The Parlakimidi and Tekkali Zamindaris (1769-1803)	127
VI Active Sub-Feudatory Zamindaris	171
VII Passive Sub-Feudatory Zamindaris	195
VIII Conclusion and Epilogue	230
Select Bibliography	238
Glossary	247
Index	253
Errata	256

FOREWORD

It is with great pleasure that I write this foreword to the monograph entitled "Vizagapatam District (1769-1834)-A History of the Relations Between the Zamindars and the East India Company" by Dr. M. S. R. Anjaneyulu of the History Department of Andhra University, Waltair. One important feature of the monograph is that it is based on a careful examination of the Records of East India Company. Indian Scholars have not so far made use of them in studying local history to the extent to which they should be used. Dr. Anjaneyulu has recognised their value not only for the light they throw on the history of the Company but also on the history of the Native Aristocracy during the period under study. Of the Zamindars who constituted the aristocracy the most powerful were the Rajas of Vizianagaram who succeeded in bringing all other Zamindars in the district under their control. One of Dr. Anjaneyulu's findings is that the development of Vizianagaram as a power is better outlined in these records, and especially in Edward Cotsford's letter of January 13, 1777 to the Court of Directors. Cotsford's account is more reliable than not only what is found in Grant's Survey of Northern Circars but in Mackenzie manuscripts, and in the chronicles of Pusapati family, and in the other sources of information. Dr. Anjaneyulu has only used the Company's records for the limited purpose of delineating the relations between the company and the local Zamindars but they deserve to be studied for the light they throw on the Social, and Economic

conditions of the district. It is my hope that Dr. Anjaneyulu will undertake such a study for which he is eminently fitted.

A second feature of the monograph is that it is a study of the transition of a polity which was essentially medieval in character to what may be called a modern polity. In the medieval system power was highly decentralised. The Nizam who called himself the ruler of Northern Sarkars of which Vizagapatam District was a part was unable to exercise real control over the Zamindars who were in law merely Collectors of Revenue. In practice they became a law unto themselves. They rarely paid to him the revenue they collected on his behalf. They were always in arrears, and he had not the military strength to bring them round, and assert his authority. The Zamindars not only defied him but also fought among themselves. They were responsible for the maintenance of law, and order but they did not pay any attention to this primary duty which every government has to discharge. All this meant utter chaos, and anarchy, and how chaotic the situation was is illustrated by the case studies which Dr. Anjaneyulu has made in the second part of his monograph. The real sufferers were the ryots, and all other sections of the people.

This was what may be called the "Political Culture" of India not only in the 18th century but also in earlier times. The central authority was generally weak, the real power being exercised by local feudatories. It was this which enabled the French and the British to intervene in the political affairs of this part of the Country. The French were

the first to gain political ascendancy over the Nizam but the English East India Company awoke to the seriousness of the situation, and because of their superior naval, and military strength, and richer economic resources they were able to oust the French, and establish themselves in power over the Sarkars by 1769. In this the then Raja of Vizianagaram helped them but this did not result in any great political advantage to him in the long run.

What is specially to be noted is that the Company came from a Country whose political culture was entirely different from that of this part of India by 1769. Britain also suffered for centuries from the evils of localised power wielded by the feudal nobility but by the time of Tudors who became rulers in the 16th century the feudal nobility were completely suppressed, and power became highly centralised in the hands of despotic monarchs who evolved an efficient system of administration. This was also the case in countries on the continent - especially France, Spain and Portugal. A new doctrine of sovereignty was enunciated by political thinkers like Bodin and Hobbes. The only question at issue in the 17th century Britain was who should be the sovereign - the king or Parliament. The Civil War, and the revolution of 1688 decided once for all that Parliament should be Sovereign. No one, however, disputed the fact of Sovereignty, and the need for it. There was no local power which was in a position to dispute the Sovereignty of the Centre. The 16th and 17th centuries witnessed in England the passing away completely of the decentralised political culture of the middle ages, and the rise of modern centralised political culture.

It was with this new tradition of centralised political culture that the East India Company was determined to make its power real. The Zamindars naturally resented it. They wished to deal with the Company in the same way as they dealt with the Nizam. But they had not the military, and financial resources to fight the Company. The Company put down with a high hand the rebellious Zamindars including the Raja of Vizianagaram the most powerful among them when he suffered defeat and death in the battle of Padmanabham in 1794. The Company deprived them of their military forces, and of their police powers. All authority was concentrated in the hands of the district collector. Over several parts of the district the system of agency administration was introduced, and this considerably enhanced the personal authority of the Collector. Law and order were established; justice was systematically administered through a new set of courts. All this no doubt took time but by 1834 the administration became modernised, and the days of medievalism were over.

It is in this process of modernisation that the real significance of the events narrated by Dr. Anjaneyulu lies. The Company's Rule brought many economic evils along with it. There was the decline of industries. Agriculture became the sole occupation of the majority of the people. There was the rise of a class of landless labour, and the affluence of parasitic classes like the village money lenders, and richer landlords. In spite of all this the political, and administrative system introduced by the Company was a great step in the process of the country's modernisation, and this was of lasting advantage to the people. Incompetent Fouzdars, and rebellious Zamindars were replaced by a highly efficient cadre of district collectors, and other members of the civil service. It is from this point of view that special importance has to be attached to Dr. Anjaneyulu's monograph.

P R E F A C E

This is a study of the relations between the Zamindars and the English East India Company, from 1769 to 1834 in the Vizagapatam District, a unit of the former Madras Presidency. It attempts to study the peculiar political conditions and physical features of this remote and strategic region. It is an examination of the various powerful forces that drifted the relations between the agents of British power in their direct contact with the Zamindars of the district. It is a detailed study and reconstruction of the history of the region of this crucial transitional period witnessing the transfer of power from the native Zamindars to the British, their interaction and ultimate prevalence of the latter.

This kind of study is pursued with a view to trace the beginnings of the emergence of modern Andhra with special reference to Vizagapatam District.

The core of this thesis rests on an examination of manuscript materials in the Vizagapatam District Records, a hitherto untapped source stretching from 1769 to 1835. I am greatly indebted to the Director of Andhra Pradesh State Archives, Hyderabad, for making them available to me. I also extend my grateful thanks to the Commissioner of Tamil Nadu Archives, Madras and Librarians of the Oriental Manuscript Library, Madras, Gautami Library and Rallabandi Subba Rao Government Museum, Rajahmundry for allowing me to consult records and books.

I am highly grateful to revered late Prof. M. Venkatarangaiya for his Foreword to this thesis.

I am thankful to Dr. E. Suryanarayana Murty, Professor of History, Andhra University, for his precious guidance in preparing the thesis. My thanks are due to Prof. K. Viswanadham (Professor of English, Andhra University) for his invaluable suggestions concerning the expression while finalising the thesis for publication.

I am indebted to the Authorities of Andhra University for granting permission and financial assistance for the publication of this thesis.

ANDHRA UNIVERSITY

M. S. R. A.

ABBREVIATIONS

BOR	Board of Revenue
BORC	Board of Revenue Consultations
JAHRS	Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society
MC	Military Consultations
MRO	Madras Record Office
RC	Revenue Consultations
RFSG: Despatches	Records of Fort St. George : Despatches to England
RESG : Diary	Records of Fort St. George : Diary and Consultations Books
RFSG : Letters to FSG	Records of Fort St. George : Letters to Fort St. George :
RFSG : Letters from FSG	Records of Fort St. George : Letters from Fort St. George
VDR	Vizag District Records

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The district of Vizagapatam¹ (Visakhapatnam) lies between $17^{\circ}14'30''$ and $18^{\circ}58'$ North latitude and between $82^{\circ}19'$ and $83^{\circ}59'$ East longitude². It has a coast line of 110 miles and an extreme inland extension of about 180 miles. In area it was the largest district in the Madras Presidency and a large one in India, covering 18,344 square miles. It was bounded on the north by the district of Ganjam and the Central Provinces (Madhya Pradesh), on the east by Ganjam and the sea, on the south by the sea and the Godavari district and on the west by the Central Provinces. It consisted of 14 Zamindaris, 37 proprietary estates and 3 Government taluks. The administrative head-quarters are at the town of Vizagapatam (Visakhapatnam).

Vizagapatam district was in the northern part of the Madras Presidency, i.e., the Northern Circars³. It is a beautiful, picturesque, and hilly country, but in the greater part, most unhealthy. A chain of the Eastern Ghats runs through the district in an oblique direction from north-east to south-west, dividing it into two unequal portions, the larger being mountainous and the smaller flat. The higher peaks of this range are more than 5,000 feet high above the sea level. The mountain slopes are clothed with luxuriant vegetation, consisting of tall forest trees, and the graceful bamboo grows profusely in the valleys. This range forms the watershed. There are numerous streams flowing into the sea. Some flow into the Godavari forming the Indravati and the Saveri or the Sileru rivers. Along the north of the Jeypore

region another watershed separates the drainage between the Mahanadi and the Godavari consisting tributaries of the former, particularly the Tel. To the west of the Eastern Ghats was the major part of the Jeypore Zamindari, mostly hilly and jungly, and consisted of the fertile Indravati valley. The north and north-west of the district, inhabited by Khonds and Sowrahs, is also mountainous. In the extreme north, the Nimgiris, rise to a height of 4,972 feet above the sea level and they are separated by valleys of not more than 1,200 feet deep from the neighbouring ranges. The drainage from the Nimgiris flows south-east forming the rivers at Chicacole and Calingapatam.⁴ The plains of the district, comprising from 5 to 6000 square miles and situated on the coast, are very fertile. The principal rivers are (1) the Nagavali with two important feeders, the Makkuva and Salur branches, which disembogue at Chicacole, (2) the Gostani, which disembogues at Konadah, (3) the Bimlipatam river, (4) the Sharadanadi and (5) the Varahanadi. The last two fall into the sea at Wattada about thirty-five miles south of Vizagapatam. There are forest areas in the Palakonda hills in the north, in the Golgonda hills to the south-west and in the coastal taluk of Sarvasiddhi.

The above geographical features of the district created different climates : it is moist and relaxing along the coast, hotter and drier in land, and wettest and coldest in the hills. The most prevalent disease was malaria whose intensity varied according to locality, being mild in the plains and endemic and severe in the hill regions. Beri-Beri and elephantiasis prevail mostly along the coast.⁵

Vizagapatam, the head-quarters, has grand

natural features. The scenery is beautiful, and the buildings in the Fort, on the hills and along the beach are picturesque. It is an important port on the Coromandel Coast. Its conspicuous land-mark is the head-land or promontory called the "Dolphin's Nose", on the summit of which stands the remains of an old castle with a flag staff in its centre.

The topography of the district largely moulded its history. It was very difficult for the unaccustomed troops to operate and remain in the hills particularly in the rainy season, when because of the unhealthy climate the sickness and mortality was alarming and obliged them to return leaving the country at the mercy of recalcitrant chiefs and other disturbing elements. The Eastern Ghats made this region impregnable. They abounded in thick bamboo forests, and in those days of infantry and cavalry warfare, it was difficult for the enemy to operate effectively. "The hill Zamindars, secure in the woody and unwholesome heights which they inhabited, and encouraged by the hope of an eventual asylum in the dominions of the Nizam, or of the rajah of Berar, had often furnished examples of successful depredation and unpunished revolt. They were surrounded by military tenants whose lands were held on stipulations of personal service; and whose attachment to their chiefs was increased by the bond of family connection".⁶

Thus these geographical conditions coupled with the turbulence of the hill chiefs made it difficult to control them. Even the Pusapati family, which had the title of 'Manne Sultan', could not control them effectively. The deposed Zamindars always troubled them with 'fituries' and deprived them of much

revenue. These circumstances forced Sitarama Raju to suffer the existence of the Zamindaris of Jeypore, Golconda, Palakonda and Andra and spend huge amounts on frequent expeditions, sometimes assisted by the Company's troops to suppress recalcitrant elements and collect the revenue. Further the hill stations had also to be garrisoned. These financial burdens were virtually impoverishing the great Vizianagaram Zamindari and its arrears of jama to the Company became chronic. When pressed by the Company for the regular payments, they borrowed from merchants, both native and foreign, at an abnormal rate of interest. Hence, they could not maintain their hereditary influence over the hill regions and punctuality in payments to the Company. This led to the sequestration of the Zamindari and other fateful consequences which undermined it ultimately.

Even the Company, after bringing the hill Zamindars under its direct control, experienced still more difficulties in controlling them. Although it could deal well with the Vizianagaram Zamindari, it could not do so with the hill Zamindaris. There were frequent and scattered disturbances in the hills mainly because of disputed successions. At last the Company could take the effective measure of appointing a Special Commissioner in 1832 to suppress the disturbances and the Agency system of Government was established in the district in 1839.

As far as the historical background is concerned the Northern Circars formed a part of the great Vizianagara Empire till the battle of Tallikota. Thereafter they became part of the Golkonda Sultanate and remained so for more than a century. In

1687 they were occupied by Aurangzeb. In 1724 they came under the control of Nizam-ul-Mulk, the Subahdar of the Deccan.

In this region the English and the French East India Companies had several factories. They struggled for commercial supremacy. After the death of Nizam-ul-Mulk, the French and the English took sides in the succession disputes. Eventually a French protege, Salabat Jang, became the Nizam. In 1753 he ceded four of the five Northern Circars to the French. But in 1759 the success of the combined forces of Vizianagaram and the English established the virtual English supremacy in the Circars and enabled the English in 1768 to secure them from the Nizam, "by way of inam or free gift"⁷ subject to an annual payment of seven lakhs of rupees.

The Chicacole Circar was divided into three divisions i.e., Ichchapur, Chicacole and Kasimkota⁸. Since the establishment of the Company's government the whole province was unequally divided and placed under two subordinate councils of which the most considerable was that of Vizagapatam nearly "central to all the circars"⁹. About the middle of the 17th century a factory was established at Vizagapatam where, on the cession of the Circars, the Chief-in-Council was appointed.

In 1512 the Sultanate of Golkonda was founded. About 1571 Sultan Ibrahim occupied the Godavari and other districts as far north as Chicacole. For about one hundred and eighty years the Vizagapatam district then known as Kasimkota division of the Chicacole Circar was ruled by the nominal Hindu feudatories of the Sultanate.

The chief local officer was the Faujdar of Chicacole, who was in-charge of Ganjam and Vizagapatam regions. The first Faujdar was Sher Muhammad Khan (1652-84). He governed through the local chiefs or Zamindars, to whom the collection of the revenue was farmed out on a commission of ten per cent and they were also expected to keep their charges quiet¹⁰. They maintained the accounts of financial matters. The Faujdar had only revenue jurisdiction and was not concerned with the administration. He could maintain a small force for his personal safety¹¹. The revenue collection was slack and uncertain, depending on the capacity and integrity of the Faujdar. From 1740 the rulers of Vizianagaram became prominent. They were not paying the tribute to the weak Faujdars who used to purchase their co-operation to maintain themselves. "The Muhammadan sway seems to have been weak and the revolts of the Zamindars were common".¹²

Like other Circars, the Chicacole Circar was also imperfectly subjected to the Nizam. Being the remote and largest of the Circars it was problematic. The changes in the climate of the hill regions made it liable to unpredictable and unfavourable climate. The hill regions were inaccessible to the troops unaccustomed to the narrow slopes and varying heights of the hills. The rising power of the Vizianagaram Zamindari proved a hurdle to the Faujdars. These circumstances forced them to realize that they could not function without the local support. Further many of them were selfish, greedy and unscrupulous. So they created personal attachments through individual favours to local Rajas. This facilitated the rapid expansion of the Zamindari of Vizianagaram.¹³

rebel Faujdar, Anvarally Khan. This marked the end of the Faujdari rule. Chicacole and Rajahmundry Circars came under the authority of Ananda Raju¹⁸. He died on 25 February 1760. Nominally the Northern Circars reverted to the Nizam and they were transferred to the Company in 1766. In that interval the administration was disorganized. "In consequence of which, for seven succeeding years (1759-1766), the completest anarchy recorded in the history of Hindostan, prevailed over all the five greater Northern Circars"¹⁹.

Thus the Chicacole Circar was under the Faujdari rule for a period of a hundred and seven years (1652-1759). During this period, the Muhammadan authority over the Circar was nominal. The Faujdars could not control the local Rajas who were virtually independent. Especially, the rulers of Vizianagaram never submitted to their authority and established their supremacy in the district which reached its zenith in 1759.

The Zamindaris of the district may be classified into two classes; those situated in the hills and those whose principal possessions were in the plains. From the historical point of view, Jeypore, Vizianagaram, Bobbili, Golconda, Palakonda, Kurupam, Madugula, Kasipuram, Salur, Sangamvalasa, Merangi and Kimidi and Tekkali²⁰ were important. Of these Vizianagaram, Bobbili and one or two smaller Zamindaris were in the plains. Among the hill Zamindaris, the largest and most important was Jeypore followed by Kurupam, Madugula, Palakonda and Golconda. Vizianagaram was the most powerful Zamindari in the district and controlled the other Zamindaris²¹ including Bobbili²².

Jeypore was the most ancient and largest hill Zamindari. The ancestors of Jeypore family were natives of the soil. An ancestor held not only the territory within the limits of the Jeypore Zamindari at the time of Permanent Settlement, but all the hill Zamindaris at the base of the ghats. The ancestors of the Pusapati family served under them in key positions. The Jeypore peshkash was Rs. 24,000. The rulers of Jeypore formed various hill Zamindaris and conferred them on favourites. The turn of events changed the political map of the district. The Jeypore Zamindari began to lose its grip on its subordinates wherefore the hill Zamindars became independent and the Vizianagaram Zamindari became supreme.

The ancestor of the Pusapati family was an outsider. He entered the district in the train of Sher Muhammad Khan in 1652. With their discipline, diplomacy and statesmanship the Zamindars who were former sirdars and village-renters gradually carved out a big Zamindari which became the most powerful, "The family did not interfere with any of the Zamindaries until sometime between 1734 and 1741"²³. Gradually they subjugated almost all the hill Zamindaris including Jeypore. For sometime they obtained the friendship of the Kimidi Zamindar and soon subordinated it. Owing to their preoccupation with Bobbili and hill Zamindaris, they refrained from encroaching into it. The Bobbili Zamindari was tough till 1757. The Zamindaris of Srungavarapukota, Madugula, Kurupam, Salur, Sangamvalasa, Tada and Chemudu were annexed. Palakonda, Golgonda, Jeypore and Andra became tributary Zamindaris. Thus, in April 1760 when

Vijayarama Raju was proclaimed as the Raja of Vizianagaram Zamindari, the Chicacole Circar except Kimidi and Tekkali, was under his control.

Thus the political history of the Chicacole Circar between the second half of the seventeenth century and the first half of the eighteenth century was the history of rise of the Vizianagaram rulers. They exacted tribute from the other Zamindars, undermined the Faujdars and emerged as the foremost power in the Circar.

REFERENCES

1. The term Vizagapatam is properly Visakhapatnam the city of Visakha temple. K. V. S. Murty, *Visakhmandala Charitramu* (Telugu) Kakinada, 1977, pp. 1-2. It is now a district in Andhra Pradesh.
2. Manual of the Administration of the Madras Presidency (Madras, 1885) Vol. I, p. 139.
3. James Grant, "Political Survey of the Northern Circars", in the Fifth Report from the Select Committee on the Affairs of the East India Company, edited by W. F. Firminger (Madras, 1866), Vol. II, p. 133.
4. Manual of the Administration, p. 139.
5. W. W. Hunter, *The Imperial Gazetteer of India* (Oxford, 1908), Vol. XXIV, p. 324.
6. W. F. Firminger, *The Fifth Report*, Vol. II, p. 5.
7. Vide Section 2, Madras Regulation No. XXXI of 1802.
8. T. J. Maltby, *The Ganjam District Manual* (Madras, 1918), p. 90.
9. James Grant, *Op. Cit.*, p. 216.
10. W. Francis, *District Gazetteer for Vizagapatam* (Madras, 1907), p. 30.
11. K. V. S. Murty, *Op. Cit.*, p. 39.
12. W. Francis, *Op. Cit.*, p. 30.

13. Edward Cotsford's letter to the Court of Directors dated 13 January 1777, 20 December 1784; RC (16 C : 1469-1503).
14. Ananda Gajapathi III, Vizianagaram Treaty (Madras, 1894), p. 26.
15. Manual of the Administration, p. 139.
16. Ananda Gajapathi III, Op. Cit., pp. 26-27.
17. K. V. S. Murty, Op. Cit., pp. 56-63.
18. R. O. Cambridge, An Account of the War in India (London, 1761), p. 277.
19. James Grant, Op. Cit., p. 146
20. Until they were included in the Ganjam District in 1803.
21. The exceptions being Kimidi and Tekkali.
22. From the Battle of Bobbili (1757) to the Battle of Padmanabham (1794).
23. Edward Cotsford, Op. Cit., 20 December 1784, RC (16 C : 1473).

CHAPTER II

From the Foundation of Vizagapatam Settlement to the Establishment of the Company's Authority in the District (1682-1769)

The Golden 'Firman' For Trade in the Sultanate of Golkonda¹ dated 26 February 1634 mentions Vizagapatam along with Masulipatam, Nizampatam and Bimlipatam. Sultan Abdullah Qutb Shah granted his 'favour and protection' to Captain Thomas Joyce to carry on the trade 'freely and plentifully' for mutual advantage. Thus the English were familiar with Vizagapatam and established commercial relations with the native mercantile community there from the fourth decade of the seventeenth century. But it was only in August 1682 that a factory was established. The origins of this factory may be traced to a Despatch from England. In their Despatch of 15 February 1681² the Directors wrote to Fort St. George that an 'interloper was designed for Metchlepatam or Gingerly'³ and left it to the Madras authorities to consider the possibility for establishing a 'standing factory' at Vizagapatam. They also noted that it was a 'very cheap place of provisions abounding with all sorts of goods'⁴. There was no other European rival. Even the Dutch did not have a settlement⁵. The Madras Consultations of 1 August 1682 say that 'The Company having resolved to make some Investments this year at Gingerly and gives order to Y Agent & c to send down some persons to further the same, as likewise to hinder and defeat any Interlopers that shall come there', 'tis resolved that George Ramsden does

proceed for this year as Chiefe there', his second in Council being one Clement du Jardin. The fear of rivalry of the 'ubiquitous interloper' hastened the Company to settle in Vizagapatam.

The fortunes of the English between the foundation of the settlement (1682) and establishment of their authority in the Circars (1769) may be divided into two main divisions, viz., the Mercantile period (1682-1753) and the political period of acquisition of Chicacole Circar (1753-1769).

Upto 1694 the English were preoccupied in obtaining kauls from the 'Sarlashcars of Carlinga County'⁶ to complete their settlement with larger privileges. According to the first kaul of 13 September 1682 obtained by George Ramsden,⁷ the English were allowed "to settle and trade in goods like coffee, tuttenagne, tin, pepper, butter, oil, etc., without paying any customes or dutys". Another kaul of January 1685⁸ obtained by Richard Browne exempted the Company's goods from land customs, granted privileges over Vizagapatam and permission to build a factory there and make the settlement important. On 13 September 1689, owing to the Anglo-Mughal conflict, the Vizagapatam factory was seized by the 'Rashwar' under the orders of the 'Seerlashcar of Chicacole'⁹. The Chief, John Stables, and employees, Messrs. Hall and Croke were killed and the rest were imprisoned. All the concerns of the Company we seized. In 1690, after peace, a 'cowle' was granted for the renewal by the Mughal general Zulfikar Khan¹⁰. Dubois was appointed the Chief. He attempted to fortify the factory in view of the 'danger of the Polligars and thieves plundering the

people'¹¹. The Vazir did not permit this but instructed the 'Seerlashkar' to undertake the protection of the English¹².

The period from 1694 to 1757 was marked by the uncertain political and commercial conditions of the Circar and insecurity which impelled the Chiefs to establish and strengthen the fortifications around the factory. These factors moulded the course of the Company.

From 1694 onwards the political condition began to change rapidly. The local rajas, led by the Raja of Potnuru, the ancestor of the Pusapati family of Vizianagaram, were in revolt until 1753. Fort St. George records are full of these accounts. Thus the English carefully watched and studied these conditions and developments. The Faujdars were repeatedly humiliated. In 1702 Mustaband Khan, the Faujdar, purchased peace by one lakh of rupees¹³. In 1712 Ananda Raju of Vizianagaram threatened Chicacole. In 1713 the Fort of Vizianagaram was constructed and in 1724 Vijayarama Raju became the Faujdar¹⁴. From 1740 onwards Vizianagaram Rajas became all powerful. The Faujdars were secondary. In 1753 Chicacole Circar was ceded to the French.

The main problem of the English pertained to commerce, the basis of their existence at Vizagapatam. Owing to the frequent military operations among the native Zamindars and the hostility of the Faujdars, the English trade was irregular. At times it was completely disrupted. Further, the English had to fortify the factory at great expense frequently and purchase the favour of the Faujdars by supply-

ing gunpowder and presenting gifts. The maladministration at Vizagapatam by the incompetent chiefs complicated the matters¹⁵. Once they were involved in local struggles¹⁶. The Directors often admonished and instructed them to 'retrench' the expenses and, if they were unsuccessful in their endeavours, to withdraw the factory after due consideration of all circumstances¹⁷. The increase of profits during the peaceful intervals and the cheapness of goods enabled them to continue the settlement. Still the Directors often advised them not to fish in the troubled waters, remembering that they were merchants¹⁸. They only advised sufficient defence as and when necessary and emphasized 'prudence, diligence, ability and more than all, integrity'¹⁹.

It was a period of disorder. The Faujdars depended on the local Rajas. Hence the English had to study the political conditions, especially the psychology of local powers. They began to ignore the Faujdars but maintained cordial relations with the Zamindars, especially the Pusapati family, for commercial reasons.

However, the English suffered much. From 1690-1702 they faced the raids of local powers. There were frequent disruptions of trade from 1690 to 1710. The Faujdars' representatives often demanded presents. The English had to borrow from Fakirullah Khan, the Faujdar, to improve their trade by financing the development of local Chiefs and fell out with him. He was partially repaid later on. The English faced the Maratha raids also in 1740s.

In 1694, when the Faujdar could no longer

protect the English, the chief, Holcombe, began to fortify without Faujdar's approval²⁰. The latter nominally objected. Holcombe died in May 1705. From 1705 to 1753 fortifications and buildings were repaired, outworks were reconstructed and the strength of the garrison enhanced as and when necessary.

These fortifications furthered the English commercial interests largely, providing enough security. In 1742 at the Maratha threat the Chief gave refuge to the families of the local Rajas²¹. Yet, these fortifications were weak requiring frequent repairs and additions. The construction of the fort was so haphazard that in 1757 it fell easily to the French. Thus though the fort was weak as against the French it was strong against the local chiefs.

Thus during this period the English at Vizagapatam were only merchants, interested in concessions. They were neutral and tried to improve their trade upto 1694. By 1753, Vizagapatam had to emerge as a power because of the worsening conditions in the Circar from 1694.

The year 1753 marked a turning point in the history of Northern Circars. The French obtained the Chicacole, Rajahmundry, Ellore and Mustafanagar Circars by the treaty of Aurangabad (23 November 1753). The possession of this extensive coastal tract provided them increased opportunities for trade and enormous prestige. This significant event caused a change of attitude in the policy of Fort St. George authorities by obliging them to counteract.

The Aurangabad treaty disappointed Saunders, the Governor of Fort St. George, who coveted the Circars²². He cautioned the Council at Vizagapatam: "We are more concerned than surprised at this event when we consider what influence they have at Aurangabad by means of their troops. The possession of these countries will put it in their power greatly to hurt the Company's investment and we imagine they will lose no opportunity of doing it".²³ But the English had to bide their time.

The French acquisition of the Northern Circars displeased the local chiefs also. Prominent among them were Jaffar Ali, the Faujdar of Rajahmundry and Vijayarama Raju, the Raja of Vizianagaram. The latter was ambitious to become the master of the Circars with the English help. But the French military supremacy obliged him to put up with the French regime and manage the Chicacole Circar on favourable terms biding his time²⁴.

Jaffar Ali and Vijayarama Raju sought the English assistance in vain. The English Governor wrote to Vizagapatam, "The Nawab and the Rajah have both applied to us for assistance, it is not prudent to refuse them though we can gratify neither and yet we would willingly appear a friend to both without making any direct promise"²⁵. These subtle English machinations and recalcitrance of the Zamindars threw the Circars into turmoil.

The most remarkable feature was the steadfast friendship of Vijayarama Raju towards the English against all odds. Even though the English confined themselves to affectionate advice and promises he assured them of his royal friendship²⁶. His nephew

and successor Ananda Gajapati Raju followed suit. Further, as Bussy rebuked his late uncle, Ananda Raju was alienated²⁷. Determined to dislodge the French, he urged strongly the English to co-operate. But he received only evasive replies. Vizagapatam itself surrendered to Bussy on 27 June 1757.

Dissatisfied with the negative attitude of Fort St. George, he directly corresponded with Clive in Bengal. Bussy was suspicious of him since the battle of Bobbili and apprehending his correspondence with the English, he punished him by enhancing the pesh-kash. Exasperated, Ananda Raju wrote frantically to Fort St. George: "In short, I meet with ruin in your friendship"²⁸. When Bussy proceeded to Pondichery to lead an attack on Madras²⁹, Ananda Raju seized Vizagapatam and hoisted the English flag on the factory (2 September 1758)³⁰.

Ananda Raju's initiative was highly potential. With his characteristic vision, Clive utilised this. Moreover, Nizam Ali Khan, the younger brother of Salabat Jang, asked for his help. He despatched Col. Forde to the Circars to help the Raja and wrote to Madras: "If this expedition only threw the country into such confusion as to prevent our enemies from collecting any revenues, it will answer in a great measure, the design and the expense"³¹. The Madras Government deputed John Andrews, the Chief of Masulipatam, to co-operate with Forde.

Andrews first drew up an agreement with Ananda Raju on 21 November 1758. It stipulated "that all plunder should be equally divided; that all the countries which might be conquered should be delivered to the Rajah who was to collect the reve-

nue; but that the sea ports and towns at the mouths of the rivers should belong to the Company with the revenues of the districts annexed thereto; that no treaty for the disposal or restitution, whether of the Rajah or of the English possessions should be made without the consent of both parties; that the Rajah should supply fifty thousand rupees a month for the expenses of the army and six thousand to commence from their arrival at Vizagapatam for the particular expenses of the officers"³². It laid the responsibility for the acquisition and administration of the Circars on Ananda Raju. On this point, the Bengal Government, which was responsible for the expedition, commented that "by the tenor of Andrews' letter it appears as if he entertained thoughts of taking possession of large territories in the Company's interests on many accounts"³³. This shows that even Clive did not now prefer territorial aggrandizement. They considered themselves only auxiliaries to Ananda Raju and thus would promote their trade.

On 7 December 1758 the allies defeated the French commander Conflans at Chandurti. The Raja was not conscious of its significance. He was more anxious to acquire influence over the local Zamindars³⁴ and his reluctance to adhere to the treaty led to a fresh agreement³⁵. Accordingly, the Company agreed "that whatsoever sums the Raja might furnish should be considered as a loan and that the revenues of all the countries that might be reduced on either side of the Godavari, excepting such as belonged to the French either by establishment or grant in property should be equally divided between him and the English"³⁶.

Thus, by this new treaty the English were enti-

bled to half of the territories south of the Godavari under the French influence. They became the Raja's equal partners. Soon after this agreement the Raja and Forde marched against Masulipatam and captured it on 8 April 1759. On 14 May 1759 Salabat Jang agreed to the 'requests' of Col. Forde and made over to the English a territory extending eighty miles along the sea and twenty miles in land which, besides including Masulipatam, Nizampatam, and other important stations produced an annual revenue of forty lakhs of rupees³⁷. The French were to vacate it in a fortnight and they were debarred from the Northern Circars. He agreed not to question Ananda Raju's collusion with the English, not to demand the money collected by him during his march from Chicacole to Masulipatam and not to enhance the tribute. The English promised not to protect and assist the Nawab's enemies. They recognised the Nizam's authority over the Northern Circars. Ananda Raju could only expel the French without any advantage. He only facilitated the English supremacy. Thus during this period the Company acquired the country round Masulipatam as a first step to acquire the whole of the Circars. The treaty of 1759 recognized Salabat Jang as the master of the Circars. For seven years anarchy prevailed in the Northern Circars. In 1762, Salabat Jang was deposed by his brother Nizam Ali³⁸, who was not friendly to the English. So the circumstances were not in favour of the Company which had to bide its time.

The uncertain situation in the Circars was complicated by the sudden and premature death of Ananda Raju at Rajahmundry about 23 February 1760. The eventual succession dispute caused utter

confusion. While the struggle was bitter³⁹, Nizam Ali marched into the Circars and demanded the arrears for the Chicacole and Rajahmundry Circars. This obliged the Vizianagaram family to arrive at a compromise. Vijayarama Raju's succession was acknowledged and Sitarama Raju became diwan. Nizam Ali made Vijayarama Raju responsible for the rent of the Chicacole Circar. Hussain Ali Khan was appointed the Faujdar of Rajahmundry, Ellore and Mustaphanagar.

At the request of Masulipatam, the English tried in vain to procure Nizam Ali's confirmation of Salabat Jang's grants⁴⁰. But in 1762 the Nizam needed the English assistance against the Marathas and deputed Hussain Ali Khan to Madras with the offer of five Circars. But the Madras Government refused military alliance.

Anarchy persisted in the Circars because of the preoccupation and weakness of the Nizam and Vizianagaram respectively and the English reluctance to acquire power. The disputes between Vijayarama Raju and Sitarama Raju unsettled the Chicacole Circar. Further, the Marathas invaded the Circar. More complications arose when Nizam Ali appointed Fateh-ud-Din Mahomed Khan to the Circar superseding Sitarama Raju, supposed to be responsible for the management of the Circar on behalf of his brother⁴¹. Meanwhile Sitarama Raju subjugated Kimidi in 1761. He became the 'de facto' ruler of the Circar. He resented the appointment of Fateh-ud-Din and marched to Rajahmundry against him; and the Faujdar fled to Masulipatam.⁴² Then he threatened to capture Mugalaturru Zamindar, a friend of the English (1763)⁴³. A clash with the

Company was imminent. Nizam Ali himself, unable to deal with him asked the English assistance. Fortunately for the Company clash was averted as Sitarama Raju did not molest the Raja because of combined opposition to his unjust action. But he protested to the Company for sheltering the Raja and "openly paraded his hopes of coercing Nizam Ali into granting him the Circars as his nominal deputy" (1764)⁴⁴.

Meanwhile, the Madras and Bombay Governments, in view of the fluid conditions in the Circars and possible advantages, argued for the acquisition of the Circars⁴⁵. The Court of Directors agreed but advised caution⁴⁶. After deliberation Palk's government decided to 'rent' the Circars for a period. Kandregula Jogi Pantulu, the dubash, was appointed to negotiate with Nizam Ali (November 1764).

The instructions ⁴⁷ to Jogi Pantulu reveal that the English wanted to be the 'de facto' rulers. Finding Hussain Ali obstructive⁴⁸ the Madras Government entered into an agreement with him promising military aid to control the Circars (1765). He offered to defray the expenses. Thus, the Company would have a footing in the Circars in case of protracted negotiations with Nizam Ali⁴⁹. Jogi Pantulu obtained the ratification of the agreement with Hussain Ali.

Hussain Ali regained Ellore and Mustaphanagar Circars. Then he tried to subjugate Sitarama Raju. The Company was reluctant to alienate Sitarama Raju. However, the English disliked the garrisoning of Rajahmundry by Sitarama Raju and Madras directed Masulipatam "to dislodge him peaceably

therefrom"⁵⁰. This was accomplished. Sitarama Raju reluctantly evacuated it, observing the growing power of the English and his own insecurity at Vizianagaram because of the recalcitrance of the hill Zamindars.

Observing the English strength, Sitarama Raju entered into an agreement with the Company towards the close of October 1765⁵¹. But, dissatisfaction of Hussain Ali and the threat of Nizam Ali to march into the Circars⁵² forced the English to nullify it. They began to assist⁵³ Hussain Ali to negotiate terms with Sitarama Raju. When he pressed for military assistance to reduce Sitarama Raju, the Government observing a policy of 'caution' desired 'to explore every peaceful avenue' to reconcile Sitarama Raju and Hussain Ali, since the Company's obligations to the Vizianagaram family were substantial⁵⁴. Sitarama Raju was obdurate and the Company's troops marched to Rajahmundry. The news of Shah Alam's farman and the fact that an envoy of Nizam Ali was on his way to Masulipatam to settle the Circars, stopped the hostilities.

At this juncture on 12 August 1765 Clive obtained the grant⁵⁵ of Northern Circars from the Mughal Emperor. The English apprehending the Nizam's hostility to it awaited an opportunity and published the Sanads from Masulipatam on 3 March 1766 while the Nizam was engaged with the Bhonslay. They dismissed Hussain Ali conferring a jagir on him later on. On hearing of the publication of the Sanads the Nizam hastened to Hyderabad to oppose the English. He even thought of warring with the English but financial stringency prevented him. Ultimately he was inclined for an agreement. The

Madras Government deputed General Caillaud with "full powers for consulting the treaty". A treaty was concluded on 12 November 1766.

According to this treaty the five Circars of Rajahmundry, Ellore, Mustaphanagar, Murtizanagar and Chicacole were given as 'free gift' to the Company. The Company agreed to pay "for the three Circars of Rajahmundry, Ellore and Mustaphanagar, five lakhs of rupees and for those of Chicacole and Murtezanuggur, as soon as they are in their hand and the settling the same is well effected, two lakhs each, in all nine lakhs of rupees per annum, in whatever year the assistance of their troops shall not be required... as a consideration for the free gift of the above mentioned five Circars". The English should manage the Chicacole Circar. This signifies that the Nizam practically abandoned it. The English agreed to acquire Murtizanagar after the demise of Basalat Jang.

The Nizam, disliking the treaty of 1766, tried to invalidate it. But he was defeated by the English before Trinomalee and at Vaniembady when he allied with Hyder Ali. So, he was accommodating. On 23 February 1768 he agreed to a new treaty by which the tribute was reduced and the Circars were surrendered⁵⁶. Thus the Circars were finally secured by the English. Later they connected their Southern and Northern settlements. This was their first acquisition in South India.

Nizam Ali agreed to direct Narayana Deo of Kimidi who declared independence on the basis of an alleged sanad granted by the Nizam and other Rajas to obey the Company. The new acquisitions

were at first governed from Masulipatam, but in 1769 Andrews, the then Chief, was sent to Vizagapatam and made the first Chief in Council of the region. It is ironical that the Vizianagaram Zamindari which helped the English to acquire the Circars had to accept the English as its overlord. Thus the client became the master. The English established their authority over the Pusapatis in 1767 when they forced Sitarama Raju to comply; and he selfishly surrendered the Pusapati family. But Vizianagaram tried to preserve its independence until 1794. The English defeated it at Padmanabham in 1794, occupied the Chicacole Circar and tamed the Vizianagaram family. In 1767 the Pusapatis paid their first tribute of three lakhs to the Chief of Masulipatam for the Circar, having lost the Rajahmundry Circar⁵⁷.

Thus the Company, which established a factory at Vizagapatam in 1682, carried a precarious trade upto 1753. It changed its attitude under the pressure of the disturbed political conditions of the time and the French activities. It improved its position by acquiring the "Masulipatam Farms" during 1753-59 and established its authority in the district in 1768 by securing the Northern Circars.

R E F E R E N C E S

1. In the India office there are three independent translations of this important grant. In these translations Vizagapatam is spelled as Ishankpattann, Nisiagapatam and Izapatam. William Foster, *The English Factories in India (1634-1636)* (Oxford, 1911), p. 14.
2. Records of Fort St. George : Despatches from England (1680-82) (MRO, 1914) 1681, p. 74.
3. The term was usually applied to the coast north of the Godavari river and it extended to Jagannath. Later on it was also called Orissa Coast. Where the term is intended for a definite place, it probably means Vizagapatam. William Foster, *The English Factories in India (1642-1645)* (Oxford, 1913). pp. 75-76.
4. RFSG : DFE, op. cit. p. 74.
5. RFSG : DFE (1681-86) (MRO, 1916) 1682, p. 6. According to paragraphs 12 and 13 of Hodgson's short Description of the Dutch Settlements in the Madras Records, the Dutch settled at Bimlipatam about the year 1628. W. Francis, District Gazetteer for Vizagapatam, p. 226.
6. Apparently the same as the Faujdars of Chicacole.
7. Records of Fort St. George : Letters to Fort St. George (1681-1765), 45 Vols. (MRO, 1910-1943) 1682, p. 100.

8. RFSG : Letters to FSG (1684-85), pp. 24-26.
9. Records of Fort St. George : Diary and Consultation Books (1672/8-1756), 85 Vols. (MRO, 1910-43), 7 and 10 October 1689, pp. 85-87.
10. RFSG : Diary, 16 February 1691, p. 14.
11. RFSG : Ibid., 13 February 1692, p. 4.
12. RFSG : Ibid., 19 April 1693, p. 11.
13. K. V. S. Murty, Visakhamandala Charitramu, p. 50.
14. Ananda Gajapati III, Vizianagaram Treaty, p. 26.
15. RFSG : DFE (1696-99), 16 April 1697, p. 32 and DFE (1710-1713) (MRO, 1927), 2 February 1713, p. 77.
16. RFSG : Diary, 13 February, 21 July, 11 December 1710, pp. 16-17, 73-74, 126 and 2 April 1711, p. 37.
17. RFSG : Letters from Fort St. George (1679-1765) 40 Vols. (MRO, 1915-41), 2 May 1698, p. 50 and Ibid., 25 February 1710, pp. 19-20 and RFSG: DFE, 13 January 1713, p. 15.
18. RFSG : Letters from FSG, 26 October 1697, pp. 11-12.
19. RFSG : Diary, 12 June 1705, pp. 77-78.
20. RFSG : Diary, 7 February and 4 October 1695, pp. 17, and 129.

21. RFSG : Letters to FSG, 13 March 1742, p. 37.
22. Saunders to Richard Bouchier (Governor of Bombay) RFSG : Diary, 24 September 1752. pp. 43-46.
23. RFSG : Letters from FSG, 12 January 1754, p.3.
24. RFSG : Diary, 7 January 1754, pp. 7-8.
25. RFSG : Letters from FSG, 12 January 1754, p.3.
26. RFSG : Country Correspondence (MRO, 1913) 1757, p. 28.
27. J. D. B. Gribble, A History of the Deccan (London, 1924), Vol. II, p. 48.
28. RFSG : CC, 1758, pp. 40-41.
29. G. B. Malleson, History of the French in India (Edinburgh, 1909), p. 505. See also H. Dodwell, Dupleix and Clive (London, 1923), p. 100.
30. RFSG : CC, 1758, pp. 47-48.
31. Bengal to Madras, 14 September 1758, Select Committee Consultations, 18 October 1758, Vol. 52, pp. 416-17. Quoted in Lanka Sundaram, "The Revenue Administration of the Northern Sarkars", JAHRS, Vol. VI, p. 90.
32. RFSG : Letters to FSG. 14 December 1758, pp. 127-29. See also L. Forde. Lord Clive's Right Hand Man (London, 1910), pp. 190-91.
33. G. W. Forrest, Bengal and Madras Papers (Calcutta, 1908), Vol. III (1757-95), 15 January 1759, p. 6.

34. Samalkot Kaifiyat, Mackenzie MSS. O. M. Library, Madras.
35. RFSG : Letters to FSG, 14 December 1758, p 11
36. L. Forde, Op. Cit., pp. 71-72.
37. J. D. B. Gribble, Op. Cit., Vol. II, p. 59.
38. 1762-1803
39. Vizagapatam to Madras, 18 August 1760, MC (44 : 691-92).
40. Ibid.
41. The title of Faujdar ceased in Chicacole Circar when Ananda Raju defeated Anwaralli Khan, the Faujdar, on 11 April 1759.
42. 2 August 1763, MC (49 : 107).
43. The Raja of Mogalaturru rented from the English the farms of Tonduru and Bondada for annual rent of a lakh of rupees.
44. Sitarama Raju to Madras, 23 April 1764, MC (50 : 295).
45. Peter Auber, Rise and Progress of the British Power in India (London, 1837), Vol. I, p. 153.
46. Peter Auber, Op. Cit., pp. 153-54.
47. R. Subba Rao, "Correspondence Between the East India Company and the Kandregula Family in the Eighteenth Century". JAHRS, Vols. III, IV and IX, pp. 208-222, 61-71, 194-208
48. 15 January 1765, MC (52 : 33-35)

49. 13 February 1765, MC (52 : 118-19).
50. Masulipatam to Madras, 20 May 1765, MC (52 : 435-38).
51. By this agreement the English instead of acting as "auxiliaries" assumed the part of the "principals" in Hussain Ali's affairs. Masulipatam to Madras, 27 May 1765, MC (52 : 486-89, 49 -93).
52. The object was to collect three years' arrears due from Hussain Ali and Sitarama Raju.
53. The English entered into an agreement at the request of Hussain Ali. By this he agreed to pay two lakhs of rupees a year to the English for the expense of the Company's settlements in the Circars exclusive of the expenses of the military detachment placed under his command. 13 August 1765, MC (53 : 752-54).
54. Masulipatam to Madras, 26 August 1765, MC (53 : 781-85).
55. Masulipatam to Madras, 12 October 1765, MC (53 : 897-98). Also C. W. Aitchison, *Treaties, Engagements and Sanads*, 9 Vols. (Calcutta, 1909), Vol. IX, pp. 20-21.
56. "26 February 1768 is generally reckoned as that of the actual cession of these territories, and was so recognised by Law. Vide Section 2 Madras Regulation No. XXXI of 1802, because the sunnud of the Moghul Emperor dated 12 August 1765, assigning this territory to the English Company and the treaty with the Nizam of

12 November 1766, by which he ceded the same provinces, had no substantial operation.

“The five circars...came under the English for an annual payment of nine lakhs and military help whenever found necessary. They finally came into British possession in 1823 by the payment to the Nizam's Government of Rs. 11,66,665 in lieu of an annual tribute”. A Hand Book to the Records of the Government of India in the Imperial Record Department, 1748-1859.

57. Manual of the Administration, Vol. I, f. n. 2, p. 54.

* * *

CHAPTER III

Company's Administration in Vizagapatam (1769-1835)

After acquiring the Circars in November 1766 the Company preferred to 'administer the government' through the existing system. So Rajahmundry, Ellore and Condapally Circars were leased out for three years to Hussain Ali Khan as 'deputy'. The Circar of Chicacole was entrusted to the Pusapati family as its 'delegate'¹.

In June 1769 the native agency discontinued and the Circars were placed under the charge of 'provincial chiefs and councils'². The Chief and Council of Masulipatam was in charge of the Circars of Condapally, Rajahmundry and Ellore. The southern part of Chicacole Circar was placed under the control of the Chief and Council of Vizagapatam. Edward Cotsford was appointed a 'Resident' to the defunct Ganjam factory to revive it, and manage the Ichchapur division³. This 'internal government'⁴ continued upto 20 November 1794. The provincial boards had the revenue jurisdiction.

The primary object of the direct management was to transact revenue affairs systematically. The English realized that the country has suffered anarchy since a decade. So they aimed at cultivating the Circars as regular revenue yielding areas to enable them to meet the new burden of their acquisition which became inevitable.

The English organized direct management in

the Chicacole Circar earlier than in the three middle Circars and proceeded to subjugate it. The Pusapati family of Vizianagaram and Deo family of Parlakimidi were powerful leaders and their subjugation was necessary.

At the beginning of the period of Vijayarama Raju II in April 1760 the hill rulers were his vassals. The effective control and vigorous activities of Sitarama Raju enhanced the prestige and influence of Vizianagaram.

According to the treaty of 1766 the Company had to settle the Chicacole Circar. In 1767 they sent up Hussain Ali Khan and Kandregula Jogi Pantulu to negotiate with Vizianagaram⁵. Sitarama Raju protested against the summary treatment of the English regarding the peshkash but ultimately⁶ agreed to pay three lakhs for 'his Zamindari'⁷. The Ichchapur paragana was rented to nine Zamindars and the Chicacole haveli to Akkaji. These measures affected the power and authority of Vizianagaram.

Early in 1767 Edward Cotsford, as ordered by the Madras Government on 2 November 1766, proceeded to Ganjam to settle the affairs there and in the Ichchapur division. He found the country highly disturbed. Narayana Deo of Parlakimidi⁸ refused to acknowledge the Company. He intercepted communications between Bengal and Madras. The policy of decentralization and divided management of the Company, even before their authority all over the Circar was established, weakened Vizianagaram, eliminated the controlling power and exposed the region to Narayana Deo.

Matters came to a crisis when Nizam Ali⁹ invested Narayana Deo as his 'naib' of the Chicacole Circar, when he was free from the Marathas and Mysore pressure and ordered him to dispossess¹⁰ Sitarama Raju of his usurpations, and sequester the Zamindari, if he opposed and destroy the British power in the Circars¹¹. He immediately occupied the Ichchapuram paragana in the name of Nizam Ali and ravaged Rajam and Bobbili belonging to Vizianagaram¹². Even the combined troops of Sitarama Raju and the Company were helpless and there was anarchy.

On 26 April 1768, the Madras Government issued detailed instructions to Cotsford re-appointing¹³ him to subjugate the rebellious Zamindars¹⁴. Col. Peach, with his Bengal troops, was ordered to assist him. In May 1768 they compelled Narayana Deo to flee to the adjacent Maliah country. It was deemed prudent to instal one of his sons to avoid further troubles. Gajapati Deo was proclaimed Raja. The actual management of the Zamindari was however entrusted to Rama Jogi, ex-diwan¹⁵.

Col. Peach quit Parlakimidi about 12 December 1768 and marched to Vizagapatam. But soon there were disturbances. In January 1769 Narayana Deo resumed depredations occupying Parlakimidi¹⁶. They affected the Company's revenues and commerce. He was also intriguing with the Marathas in Cuttack, against the English. But there were dissensions in the Maratha Camp.

For all this Costford pointed out to the Madras Council, in March 1769, the necessity of a Chief or Resident at Chicacole, supported by five companies

of sepoys to manage Kasimkota and Chicacole "not only respecting the rents of the Haveli lands, but of the different Zamindars dependent thereon, and to observe as a check on Narayana Deo"¹⁷. Though the Government ignored this, they thought it convenient to upgrade the 'factory' chiefship of Vizagapatam to a 'provincial' chiefship to restore peace and order, to improve commerce and to secure their revenues. Vizagapatam Chiefship came into existence in June 1769¹⁸ and began to function from 27 July 1769¹⁹ with John Andrews as its first Chief.

Baffled by a Zamindar, the Madras authorities decided on stern measures. They ordered again the Bengal detachment to march into the Circar. A Madras detachment was also detailed to assist Cotsford²⁰. With this the Company could subjugate Narayana Deo and other disturbers.

Even though the Company acquired full revenue rights over the Northern Circars in 1768 and took up direct management through chiefs, its attitude was that of a tradesman and revenue collector. Its sole object was to obtain money, which was only possible through the agency of local rulers. The Pusapati brothers and others maintained their own troops and were engaged in mutual struggles. Their payment of tribute to the Company depended on its ability to coerce them. They felt the same difficulty regarding haveli lands rented to the local chiefs. As early as 1770 the Court of Directors criticized the revenue position of the Circars²¹. Regarding the Chicacole Circar they observed that "its produce far exceeds what we receive from it". Vizianagaram also was in arrears. The failure of the Vizagapatam farms and haveli lands of the Company and large

arrears of the Zamindars and renters resulted in an inquiry to devise remedies.

The Company's servants had no administrative experience. They were 'bargaining traders' even in administration. Further, they were ignorant of the language and customs of the people. Having no access to detailed and authentic local information they had to depend upon the few who were slightly conversant with the English language²². Most of the local servants of the Company were corrupt and inefficient and intrigued with the local powers. This undesirable position reached climax by 1775.

"The disappointment in their expectations of pecuniary supply from the Northern Circars, as from their **other dominions**, and the sense which they entertained of the defects of the existing administration, had recommended to the Court of Directors the formation of the Committee of Circuit"²³. In a letter dated 12 April 1775 they ordered the appointment of Circuit Committee "to investigate the state of the Northern Circars"²⁴. They issued detailed instructions to the Presidency of Fort St. George. The Committee was to consist of five members of the Madras Council and was directed "to acquire a complete knowledge of the territories which have been granted to the Company on the Coast of Coramandel and establish a judicious and permanent system for their future management".

An examination of these instructions reveals that the Company preferred to play political role also as it evinced interest in the peace and order, judicial administration and welfare of the people. Thus the appointment of the Circuit Committee

marks a significant turn in the Company's position and role particularly in the remote Chicacole Circar. The Company had to assume political role to systematize and stabilize the revenue administration.

The tumultuous and unfortunate administration at Madras at this time because of the differences between Lord Pigot²⁵ and his council, which culminated in his imprisonment, impeded the immediate appointment of the Circuit Committee. It was appointed on 11 October 1776,¹⁶ consisting of John Holland,, Crawford, Johnson, Peter Perring and Charles Floyer to investigate in the first instance the revenues of the Chicacole Circar²⁷. Instructions²⁸ were issued to it on 31 October 1776 by George Stratton, who was elected President and Governor by the majority in Council, to implement the directives of the Court. The Madras Government urged it to inquire "in the most expeditious and effectual manner possible".

In 1777 the Circuit Committee after the preliminary study of the Vizapatam records turned to the 'tangled morass' of Vizianagaram politics which came to a climax now because of the rivalry between Vijayarama Raju and Sitarama Raju.

Sir Thomas Rumbold²⁹ arrived in Madras on 8 February 1778. On 24 March he 'delivered' a minute in the Council advocating the suspension of the Circuit Committee. The Government unanimously resolved that "the appointment of the Committee of Circuit be for the present discontinued" and wrote home "that it would be impolitic, expensive and unnecessary in every point of view to con-

tinue the plan that had been adopted previous to our arrival"³⁰. In their letter³¹ to Vizagapatam, they wrote, that, "the Circars shall be in future settled at the Presidency" and directed the Chief "to signify to all the Zamindars dependant on the settlement and the Innamdars of the respective countries under them, that it is their order they proceed to the Presidency without loss of time ...". They also wrote separate letters to the Zamindars expressing "in the strongest manner the necessity of an implicit acquiescence on their part....." Because of the peculiarity of Vijayarama Raju's situation they, in a special letter of 4 April³², emphasized "the absolute necessity of his paying immediate attention to their orders".

The Rumbold Government "having taken up the subject of affairs in the Chicacole District" and reflecting" on the unhappy disagreements that have subsisted for a considerable time" between the two brothers thought it best to reconcile them for settlement. There were many meetings both privately and before Rumbold, who threatened³³ Vijayarama Raju. Ultimately he was forced to reconcile himself with his brother³⁴.

After this a settlement³⁵ was reached with the brothers for the 'tribute'. Vijayarama Raju agreed for an increase of one lakh of rupees over Rs. 3,05,000 as a quinquennial settlement. The Zamindari of Anakapalli and Satyavaram were 'annexed' to the Zamindari of Vijayarama Raju in view of the 'heavy balances due' from it 'on condition that he do pay annually to the Company for the same, the sum of ninety thousand rupees, and to the family of the

deceased Payaka Rao, the further sum of ten thousand annually'. Vijayarama Raju's nomination of Narasimha Gajapati Raju, son of Sitarama Raju as his successor was confirmed and it was agreed to issue kauls in future in his name, Vijayarama Raju and Sitarama Raju standing securities. The expenses of Colonel Braithwaite's expedition were also reimbursed. It was decided to restore the fort of Vizianagaram and reinstate Sitarama Raju as the diwan.

This agreement of October 1778 exalted the power and prestige of the Company which, in turn, elevated Sitarama Raju as the 'de facto' ruler. But the reconciliation failed. Differences between the two brothers persisted till 1793 when Sitarama Raju was pensioned off and confined at Madras.

In their Despatch of 10 January 1781, the Court of Directors repudiated all the actions of Rumbold Government³⁶. The points which they deemed "deterimental to the interest of the Company" are as follows : 'The abolition of the Committee of Circuit in violation of an express appointment of the Company; the trouble and expense occasioned to the Rajahs and Zamindars, by obliging them to proceed to Fort St. George; the letting of the Havelly lands to Sitarama Raju for ten years; the cruel and unnecessary degradation of the Rajah, his brother, by that appointment; agreement for the Vizianagaram Zamindari lands ...upon terms so very inadequate to their value'.

The Circuit Committee was re-appointed in August 1783, after an interval of more than two years and a half 'de facto'. This was because of the

persistent differences in the Madras Council and the opposition of its majority. The members were Morgan Williams, President, Edward Saunders, Edward Frowd, William Oram and Hugh Maxwell³⁷. They were supplied with the instructions in the Madras Despatch of 12 April 1775. The Committee started its work on 4 October 1783.

The Circuit Committee³⁸ submitted its "proceedings in the Vizagapatam and Chicacole Districts" on 12 September 1784 and its "Report on the Cassimcota³⁹ Division of the Chicacole Circar" on 11 October 1784⁴⁰. The report contains detailed statements of the revenue and military position of the Zamindaris and Haveli lands, with important appendices of the agricultural economy of the country. The modes of revenue assessment, the methods of collecting it, the hard lot of the cultivators, ruinous taxes on merchandise and the condition of haveli were dealt with in detail. It made numerous proposals for the improvement of administration and suggested a "plan for the better Management of the Revenues of the Cassimcota Division of the Chicacole Circar".

About the military position of the Zamindars, the Committee noted that the attempts to reduce that were futile. From the revenue point of view it recommended their gradual demilitarization stating that the amount thus saved could be utilized to increase the jama. It further recommended the minimum use of Company's troops.

Regarding Vizianagaram, the Committee observed thus : ".....more than two-thirds of the Cassimcota division of this circar, the countries of Saloor,

Belgaum, Courpaum, Madgole, Bobbili, Ancapillee and Cottapollam besides others of less note now included in its Zamindari and Nandaporam, Gollondah, Polcondah and Andrah its subjected tributaries, as well as the Company's havaily are proofs of its extensive influence, ambition and oppressive systems". They considered "the reduction of a man so very equal to all events as of the most fortunate and important consequences to the Company's Government and better management of their order and numerous dependants". They suggested release of the imprisoned Zamindars of Bobbili, Saloor and Srungavarapu Kota and their families and "obliged to reside at, or in the neighbourhood of the subordination allowing each of them such stipends as you may judge proper from the Vizianagaram Cutcherry".

As to the 'Vizianagaram Military' the Committee observed that 'a force of near 8,000 men actually in the pay of that Zamindar appears unnecessarily larger for the purposes of revenue or protection of the country against robbers and must render it even without aid of the subordinate Zamindaries of too much consequence in the eyes of the other tributaries, if not alarming to Government'. Fully comprehending the Company's orders and its anxiety that "no troops but their own should be admitted in the circar" the Committee expressed the opinion that Vizianagaram Zamindar "should be permitted to retain ... at least 2,000 of the sibbendies as no other people are so equal to that service, and because the remarkable unhealthiness of those stations.. ..". This reduction of sibbendy would "occasion a yearly decrease of the Zamindar's expenses amounting to about to Rs. 4,05,601 which sum should be added to

the Company's Junmabandy'. It sounded Vijayarama Raju to learn how he would incline to any proposal to "resign his Zamindari and become a stipendiary of the Company" but found him altogether averse to it. He showed no reluctance to disband his military forces except the 'Racavars' declaring he would be disgraced by abandoning the members of his own clan.

The Committee considered that the Zamindaris of Palakonda, Golgonda and Andra should still be left as 'Tributaries' to Vijayarama Raju at an increased rate of tribute for the first two. Looking to the extent and importance of Nandapuram, it suggested "to make it a separate Zamindari increasing its jammabundy from Rs. 30,000 to 35,000".

Regarding the Kimidi Zamindar, "whose actual payments to the Company including the instalments on account of his old debt, was Rs. 1,6,000", the Committee suggested to increase his jama to Rs. 1,50,000 after "he shall have cleared off his debts",

About the Tekkali Zamindar the Committee observed thus: "The Revenue of Teckkelly is very unequal, the country being without Rivers, lying high. and depending entirely upon the rains, it amounts on an average to Rs. 68,663-4-9 from which he disburses his jammabundy Rs. 20,000. The Military charges for 590 peons is stated at Rs. 10,905 and the balance for his private expenses is Rs. 27,668-4-9. If therefore you think proper to raise his payments, the amount of the troops may be the increase of jammabundy, which will then amount to Rs. 30,905 and his peons may be reduced to 150 men".

Simultaneous and proportionate reduction of the military strength of the Zamindars and increase of their jama were the two important suggestions of the Committee. Thus it recommended the reduction of the military strength of Vizianagaram doubling its jama. Vijayarama Raju protested at this and serious consequences followed. But, as it recommended the increase of the jama of all his major feudatories, the increase of Vizianagaram jama was justified. It could not suggest an independent status to the feudatories of Vizianagaram. This was taken up only after the battle of Padmanabham in 1794. Regarding the imprisoned Zamindars the Committee recommended only internment. The significance of its work is that it "furnished the Government with a fuller and more particular view of the state and affairs" of the Circar, "than had been before received from the local authorities"⁴¹.

The Court of Directors in their instructions of 12 April 1775, directed "that at the expiration of the then subsisting settlements, the Committee of Circuit shall proceed to let the lands upon permanent leases". So, even after considering the Report of the Committee on the Kasimkota division, the Madras Government did not implement its recommendations preferring to wait "either until the Committee shall have finished their enquiries" in other Circars also, "or until the arrival of the expected Dispatches from England which there is reason to believe will contain instructions upon this subject for our guidance"⁴².

On receiving the two reports of the Committee of Circuit on the districts dependent on Masulipatam dated 9 February 1786 and 15 February 1787, the Madras Government increased the Vizianagaram

peshkash to nine lakhs. However on the basis of the observations made by the Chief and Council, the Government did not increase the peshkash of Kimidi and Tekkali Zamindaris which remained at Rs 86,000 and Rs. 20,000 respectively.

On receipt in May 1786 of a Despatch from the Court of Directors, dated 21 September 1785, important changes were introduced in the Civil and Military administration of the country. The Court ordered that the Government of the country be carried on by the Governor-General in Council through the medium of four Boards, viz, (1) The Board of Council, (2) A Military Board, (3) A Board of Revenue and (4) A Board of Trade.

The Board of Revenue was entrusted with the whole administration, settlement, collection, and receipt of every branch of revenue, subject to the control of the Board of Council. It was instituted on 1 June 1786. The President and Governor of Fort St. George presided over them⁴³.

The Madras Government after constituting the Board of Revenue was very active in revenue matters, not allowing the arrears to accumulate. They passed stringent rules to extract the jama. From 1787 onwards the Madras Government began to "keep strict eye over the conduct of Vijayarama Raju"⁴⁴. Vizagapatam Council, under Claud Russell⁴⁵ was also attentive and reported to the Presidency about his "disrespectful conduct, refractory spirit" and "contumacy in matters where the Company is concerned"⁴⁶.

The weak Vijayarama Raju left his affairs to the diwans⁴⁷ and other influential persons. He was en-

meshed in the court politics⁴⁸ and controlled by Sitarama Raju. The expensive 'mode of life, the state that is thought necessary to be kept up' his "numerous train of attendants and dependents, who are in fact hereditary pensioners, the support of family connections, religious charities and the sibbendy charges" absorbed immense sums⁴⁹. There was also drought during 1790 and 1791 and "the country suffered much by a severe famine"⁵⁰. The corrupt and weak administrative machinery and economic dislocation causing arrears exposed Vizianagaram to the Company's domineering policy.

In spite of repeated warnings by the Chief, Vijayarama Raju being "totally neglectful of public Business" was irregular in his payments. By July 1793 both old and new arrears amounted to Rs. 8,50,000,⁵¹ and the Madras Government refusing to accept the proposals of Vijayarama Raju sequestered the Zamindari in August 1793.

After sequestration, the Chief and Council proceeded to take necessary measures to restore order in the revenue administration of the Zamindari. The Raja's dues to the Company on 9 August was Rs. 6,73,353-10-8⁵². The Raja's catchery furnished him with the accounts and records. In his minute of 25 August he observed that "all is purposely evolved in intricacy and confusion" and "a great deal of attention will be requisite for the examination into all the details appertaining to the Revenue of the Zamindari". He desired 'full and clear' instructions from the Presidency upon several points relating to "the allowance for the Rajah Vijayarama Raju and Sitarama Raju who proceeded to Madras on 2 Septe-

mber 1793, the payment of arrears to the Rajah's sepoys, settlement of renters accounts, continuation of the Mokasahs and in what manner and by whom the country is to be managed"⁵³.

The Board of Revenue in their letter of 30 October to the Chief and Council issued full instructions respecting the management of the Zamindari, examination of the accounts of Vijayarama Raju's administration and ascertaining "the real state and resources of his country". The Zamindari was divided into three 'compact and equal' divisions, viz., the northern, central and southern and allotted to councillor Arthur William Gregory, the Chief John Chamier⁵⁴ and councillor John Snow respectively. Though the Chief and Council were separated, 'each taking a district division of the Zamindari under his immediate charge and besides the necessary duties of inspection and taking accounts' and enjoined "to exert their utmost endeavours, within existing engagements between the Rajah and the Renters", they were directed to "occasionally assemble to consult on the state of the country and to report" to the Government "collectively on any material points relating to the district or accounts prepared by either of the members in their separate capacity". They also "recommended to the Chief and Council in conducting separate charge to cooperate and assist each other on all occasions that may tend to promote the objects of their appointment"⁵⁵. On 4 November they took charge under the designation of collectors⁵⁶. The Board of Revenue allowed Vijayarama Raju to stay at Vizagapatam fixing his allowance at Rs. 12,000 per month. Sitarama Raju who stayed at Madras received Rs. 5,000 monthly.

At the time of sequestration Vijayarama Raju believed that the Zamindari would be restored to him "so soon as his arrears to the Company are discharged". But the Company utilized this opportunity to adopt "some permanent principles of management and to ensure a conduct on the part of the Zamindar of Vizianagaram more compatible with his situation and less dangerous to the safety of the inhabitants and the revenue" and reduce "a power inconsistent with good government which from the nature of the country, its situation and resources, if in the possession of an able as well as refractory Zamindar might prove dangerous to the interests of the Company in the event of defection, at a time when our Government may be involved in difficulties from foreign war"⁵⁷. To implement these fiscal and political measures, in April 1794 the Company despite the view expressed by the Chief that "by gentle and kind treatment Vijayarama Raju may be kept with in the line of his duty to the Company, but that if any harsh measure be put into execution at this juncture it will infallibly prove the sacrifice of his life"⁵⁸, ordered him to quit the district. Considering this order as "the greatest indignity that could be offered to him", convinced that his "total ruin was intended", tinctured with gloom and distressed at the disgrace, Vijayarama Raju, who in March 1794 informed the Chief that "he had resigned his country, his family, everything into their hands, but would not submit to any personal disgrace"⁵⁹, "firmly resolved to die"⁶⁰. As he himself put in his last letter dated 9 July before his death on 10 July addressed to Colonel Prendergast, Vijayarama Raju finding the Company "disposed to take his life and honour away"⁶¹, rushed into death to avoid ignominy and exile.

On 20 November 1794 the Madras Government, shocked by the defects in the local administration⁶², abolished the provincial Councils and appointed Collectors in their stead⁶³. They also transmitted a proclamation of 10 November 1794 to the Collectors ordering its promulgation and enclosed instructions for their guidance⁶⁴. The proclamation notified the change of system and required all Zamindars, Talookdars, and other landholders, to obey the Collectors as the Company's regular representatives. It explained the nature of the information which the Collectors should furnish and required the Zamindars and other landholders to aid them, warning them that the Government would support the Collectors and that any obstructing person be rigorously punished.

The rest of the proclamation related to "the general adjustment of differences and disputes being vested in the Collectors, prohibited all persons whatever not duly authorized from making use of the name of the Company upon any occasion on pain of the severest displeasure of Government; pointed out the process to be observed in cases of capital offences restricting the Zamindars from inflicting punishment extending to death or mutilation", and declared that this change was "to preserve to the Zamindars and landholders their just privileges to secure the happiness of the people and the peace and improvement of the country". It considered it introductory of a Permanent Settlement of "jumma bundy upon a just and equitable principle of assessment". It also reiterated the communication to the Zamindars in November 1786 that "the Company's servants are under the most solemn and positive obligations not

to accept money or any valuable thing as a gift or present from persons paying Revenue to the Company and that being exempted from any disbursements on account of Nuzzurs and presents no excuse will be admitted for deficiency or improper delay in the payments of the public Revenue according to the stipulated kists as provided for in the Cabooliats executed by them". It concluded with a detailed statement of the districts over which the authority of the Collectors respectively was to extend⁶⁵. The charge of the revenues of the division was vested in the Collector who was to reside in his division, subject to the Board of Revenue.

The Government appointed John Snow Collector in the Southern division of the Vizianagaram Zamindari, including Vizagapatam and Farms, William Brown and Cherry as his assistants, Nathaniel Webb Collector in the Northern division of the Vizianagaram Zamindari and in the Kimidi and Tekkali Zamindaris with Atkinson and Alexander as his assistants and Keating Collector in the Vizagapatam and Kasimkota 'Havelly' with Warricker as his assistant.

After implementing this "Change of administration of affairs" in the Vizagapatam "District", the Madras Government to restore peace and order in the "district" directed Webb to persuade Narayana Raju, who after the battle of Padmanabham was under the protection of the hill Zamindars, to submit himself to the Company. After receiving the letter of the Government, Webb proceeded to the hills in December 1794, for "on the spot" negotiations with Narayana Raju and his relatives to urge

them to come under the Company's protection. He succeeded as Narayana Raju and his family responded⁶⁶. Ramachandra Deo of Jeypore, who, from the extent, situation and strength of his country and consequent influence cannot but have weight in materially aiding the Collector's exertions in effecting a complete settlement of the country...", immediately "repaired in person" to Webb "without hesitation placed his confidence in the Company's representative" and "profered his assistance in reducing the refractory hill Zamindars"⁶⁷. The submission of the Pusapati family and Ramachandra Deo's assurance strengthened the Company and facilitated the establishment of its supremacy.

After placing themselves under the Company's authority and protection, Narayana Raju and his adherents repaired to Sitanagaram as ordered and stayed there under the "immediate observance" of the Collector with an allowance of Rs. 12,000 per month⁶⁸.

On 26 January 1795 the Board of Revenue recommended to the Government that the Collector should be authorized to grant Kauls conforming to the spirit of the proclamation to those Zamindars, who submitted and were in undisputed possession, on the existing jama and 'receiving from them Muchilkas binding themselves to the regular payment thereof.....'⁶⁹.

Considering that Ramachandra Deo was "the foremost in paying obedience to the orders of Government during the late disturbances"⁷⁰, his loyalty to the Company, his "resolution to abide by his duty to the Company and afford no asylum to

those who shall adopt a contrary line of conduct”⁷¹ and “the good policy of rendering easy and eligible the situation of a Tributary whose country forms the frontier Boundary between this district and the Mahratta Dominions”⁷², the Government in July 1795 granted a Kaul⁷³ confirming to him and his heirs the “countries of Jayaporum, Royagadda, Singaporam and others at present held by him”. In this Kaul, at the Collector’s suggestion, they inserted an article “requiring the Zamindar to suspend during the pleasure of Government all duties on Cotton coming from the Mahrattah countries through Jeypore into the Company’s District”⁷⁴.

This Zamindari while subordinate to Vizianagaram was previously assessed at Rs. 33,000, but in increasing this it was so dislocated that even the previous rate of tribute could not be realised. So recognizing the Zamindar’s loyalty, the peculiar situation of his Zamindari and the unhealthy climate, the condition of his Kaul⁷⁵, the Madras Government permanently fixed the jama at Rs. 25,000. The Zamindar assented to this.

After the submission of Narayana Raju and obedience of Ramachandra Deo the Madras Government ‘in order to establish the authority of Government upon a permanent basis and reduce the disaffected poligars to order’⁷⁶ followed a policy of “vigorous coercion” and deployed the troops against the refractory Zamindars. These operations and the services of Ramachandra Deo were fruitful; and by June 1795 “the country was beginning to wear a more peaceable appearance”⁷⁷. By the end of the year the Company quelled the disturbances and checked depredations through the sibbendy corps.

Only Vijayarama Raju of Palakonda and Muky Rayabhupal Raju of Srungavarapukota with captured or demolished forts were yet to submit, but "the district was in tranquillity" ⁷⁸.

During this year Narayana Raju and his adherents behaved with "uniform fidelity testifying on various occasions a sincere desire to promote the tranquillity of the Country and the general success of the Company's affairs in the district to which they were encouraged by the Governor's letter to Narayana Raju of 15 November 1794".

Adverting to the above letter and the proclamation to 10 November 1794 and also considering the 'obedient behaviour' of Narayana Raju, Webb, the Collector, in his letter dated 9 February 1796 to the Board of Revenue argued that Narayana Raju should be installed and the Hill Chiefs should be confirmed in their countries, "reannexing the Pergunnahs of Woorutlah, Coath Cotah, Woopalam and Pakinadoo to the Havelly with the Ankapilly Zamindari for reducing the power of the Vizianagaram Zamindari within the bounds which good policy required" ⁷⁹.

Considering Webb's suggestions and observing that his proposed settlement was conforming to the proclamation and personal communication between the Governor and Narayana Raju, the Madras Government on 8 March resolved upon restoring him to "the Zamindari of Vizianagaram proper" upon the following conditions ⁸⁰:

1st :- "That as a preliminary condition the sum of 4 lacs of Rupees should be paid down by Narrain

Rauze on account of the Balance due to the Company.

2nd :- "That on account of the remissions claimed in consequence of the suspension of customs ordered by Government during the late drought, the said sum of 4 lacs of Rupees should be considered a complete liquidation of all demands on the part of the company both for arrears of Jumma-band and Military charges.

3rd :- "That the Zamindaries of Jeypoor (or Nundeporam) Boobily, Polcondah, Courpaum, Maringy, Sangunvulsah, Chemadoo, Saloor, Andhra, Poram, Tadah, Bheemvaram, Casheporam, Madigole, and Golgondah, together with the Pergunnahs of Belgaum, should be freed from all interference on the part of Narrain Rauze and placed under the immediate control and authority of the Company.

4th :- "That the Pergunnahs of Worutlah, Cotah Cotah, Woopalam and Pakinadoo, together with the Anakapally Zemindary consisting of the Pergunnahs of Anakapilly, Condakurlaveram for Ennavaram and Sittevaram on Guzepetty Nagarum should be annexed to the Havelly or Government lands.

5th :- "That the Vizianagarum Zemindary should be composed of the Pergunnahs of Bogapore, Putnoor, Gundradoo, Davpilly, Conarah, Sumbaum, Vamgoodoo, Ragulavassah, Gopaulpilly, Senguia-pah, Cotah, Antowah, Lakarapah Cotah, Bimlipatam, Nowah, Relby, Penta Seemah Lovab, Semah Wodady, Pody Mootah, Coormaum, and Heremundalum.

6th :- “That Vencaputty Rauze should be entrusted with the immediate management of the Zamindary on behalf of Narrain Rauze and invested with the public character of Dewan and as a further security for his good conduct that he should subscribe the Cabooliat to be taken from Narrain Rauze binding himself to the performance of all the conditions therein stipulated.

7th :- “That the current Jumma bundy to be paid for three years from this Zemindary should be fixed at six lacs of Rupees per annum, and that all demands on account of Balances should be for ever relinquished.

8th :- “That Narrain Rauze should be answerable for all good Balances at the time of making over the Zemindary to his charge”.

The Government also approved the recommendation of the Board of Revenue on 16 March respecting an equal division, whereby the new Vizianagaram Zamindari and Hill Zamindaris formed the second division, Kasimkota, the paraganas which were added to the haveli and the Vizagapatam Farms formed the first division and the Chicacole haveli with the adjoining Zamindaris of Kimidi and Tekkali constituted the third division and appointed Webb, William Brown and Keating to the respective divisions ⁸¹.

In their letter to Webb dated 14 March the Board of Revenue, informing the Government resolutions and transmitting a draft Kaul, desired to invite Narayana Raju to furnish a statement of the proposed sabbendy for revenue collections and

promise that "he would attend to the arrangement of the number and periods of the kists adapting them to the seasons of produce and to forming a proper division of the Zamindari into sixteen quotas, in order that such portion might be assumed in case of failure, as should indemnify the Company against loss, and it was one of the stipulations in this Sunnud that lands so resumed were to be converted into Havelly for ever" ⁸².

Webb intimated these stipulations to Narayana Raju and he "willingly acceded to the terms on which it was proposed to restore him to Vizianagaram proper" ⁸³. In April 1796 the Government delivered the three year Kaul, including three more clauses obliging him to pass free of duties all "cotton and cotton thread and to exempt from taxes all weavers... to encourage the Inland Trade carried on by Bunjaries and to prevent the importation of lead, sulphur, saltpetre or Gunpowder from the neighbouring districts" ⁸⁴.

After settling Vizianagaram and Jeypore, Webb turned his attention to Hill Zamindaris. From March 1796 ⁸⁵ he negotiated settlements with Hill Zamindars and submitted a Report on 26 December "for the current year's jumma" with these Zamindars ⁸⁶.

The Zamindari of Kurupam was restored to Vairicherla Sanyasi Raju on a jama of Rs. 18,000. Satrucherla Gangaraju, "the present representative of the **Maringy** family" was retained fixing 'jumma' at Rs. 22,000. Jagannadha Bhupati was restored at **Madugula** at Rs. 25,000. Nissankudu Venkanna was reinstated in **Sangamvalsa** at Rs. 7,000. **Chemudu**

Zamindari was restored to Ranasimhuni Somaraju at Rs. 5,500. Mallaparaju was restored to the Zamindari of Tada at Rs. 5,000. Ramachandra Raju was re-instated in Salur at Rs. 40,000. Ramana Dora was retained in Andra at Rs. 1,545. Sarvapalli and Bhimavaram were added with a rent of Rs. 600 Golgonda on the death of Vijayarama Raju lapsed to Mallabhupaty and his jama was Rs. 11,000.

Palakonda was another Vizianagaram tributary. The recalcitrant Vijayarama Raju was deposed, and the Zamindari was entrusted to his eldest son, Sitarama Raju at Rs. 50,000. As Venkata Ranga Rao of Bobbili was at Hyderabad, it was handed over to his "nearest relation on the spot", Rao Venkatarayadu and "two of the most respectable of his caste people viz., Yellinky Luchenah and Damarlah Nariah with whom a jumma of Rs. 1,25,000 has been negotiated". Instead of restoring Kasipuram to recalcitrant Muky Raya Bhupal Raju, Webb rented it to Gauriah Dora, son of Ramana Dora of Andra, for Rs. 600.

Considering "the alteration in these countries, since the famine, the difficulty and tediousness of converting the produce into money in these remote parts of the district, that the Zamindars themselves have little command of money, and that their credit is yet in its infancy, together with the various other disadvantages affecting particular countries" as reported by Webb in his letter dated 25 December 1796, the Madras Government in January 1797 concurred in the Collector's views and appreciated "the zeal, integrity and talents by which it had been supported and finally accomplished"⁸⁷.

In June 1797 Ranga Rao returned from Hyderabad for reinstatement. By October a settlement was concluded. As the country was “in the most ruinous condition from the consequences of the famine, and the oppressive conduct of the Renters when under the Vizianagaram Zamindari” and considering the “peculiar situation of the Zamindar” the jama was fixed at Rs. 80,000 for the Fasli 1207⁸⁸.

With slight modification these settlements continued upto the introduction of the Permanent Settlement. At the time of the Permanent Settlement in Fasli 1213 the total jama paid by the Zamindars was Rs. 9,24,345 i. e., Vizianagaram 6,00,000, Bobbili Rs. 86,000, Palakonda Rs. 56,000, Salur Rs. 45,000, Madugula Rs. 30,000, Jeypore Rs. 25,000, Merangi Rs. 22,000, Kurupam Rs. 18,000, Golgonda Rs. 11,000, Belgaum Rs. 10,500, Sangamvalsa Rs. 7,000, Chemudu Rs. 5,500, Tada Rs. 5,000, Andra Rs. 1,545, Kasipuram Rs. 1,200 and Sarvapalli Bhimavaram Rs. 600.

After the introduction of Permanent Settlement in Bengal in 1793 it had many powerful advocates at home and in India. Some permanent system for the territories under Fort St. George, and institution of a “regular system of jurisprudence”, was long contemplated by the Court of Directors. They first expressed their desire on this in their letter of 21 April 1795. Then the Board of Revenue could not recommend it as it had to collect further information and in view of the unsettled condition of the Circars, especially Chicacole. On 3 September 1799 it reported that the Circars could receive it with some local modifications. The Madras Government on 4 September 1799

directed the Board of Revenue to "prepare the materials for forming a permanent settlement with the Zamindars whom it is our intention to constitute proprietors of their respective estates or Zamindaries on the best information which your records and the recent enquires of your collectors may afford", and desired it to 'generally' conform "to those principles on which the Permanent Settlement had been established in Bengal"⁸⁹. The instructions of the Board of Revenue to Collectors in the Circars were dated 15 October 1799. In these "general instructions" they explained the principles and objects of the proposed "new system".

In their letter dated 11 February 1801 the Court of Directors approved "for proceeding, at once, to the permanent assessment of the lands on the coast..."⁹⁰. On 9 February 1802 the Madras Government appointed a Special Commission for 'permanently settling the Lands' consisting of William Petrie, the President of the Board of Revenue as Chairman and Thomas Cockburn and Josiah Webb⁹¹. The new system was established during the years 1802 and 1804. The Collectors of the three divisions of the 'province' were directed to report upon the 'estates' under their control.

The Collector of the First division, Robert Alexander, reported to the Special Commission on 30 April 1802, dividing his charge into seventeen proprietary estates. Their total jama was Rs. 3,18,710. Except Waltair they were auctioned in 1802 and bought by the Raja of Vizianagaram for Rs. 1,62,846.

Peter Cherry, the Collector of the Third division reported on 30 April 1802. Kimidi was restored to Purushottam Narrain Deo for the first ten years at Rs. 70,000 and thereafter Rs. 80,000. Twenty estates were carved out of the Chicacole and Tekkali haveli land of which six were included in the Vizagapatam district. Their jama was fixed at Rs. 67,931 and they were auctioned for Rs. 84,589.

There were sixteen Zamindaris in the second division. Webb, the Collector, reported on 10 June 1802 on eight Zamindaris, viz., Vizianagaram, Palakonda, Kurupam, Merangi, Sangamvalsa, Chemudu, Salur and Tada-Pachipenta and his successor Robert Alexander reported on 20 April 1803 on the rest, viz., Belgaum, Bobbili, Andra, Sarvapalli, Bhimavaram, Kasipuram, Madugula, Golgonda and Jeypore⁹².

Webb submitted an Abstract of gross and net revenue of Zamindaris excluding inhabitant's share, maniams, etc., ready money collections of all kinds. He also furnished an Abstract of the collections of three years and their average for each Zamindari and particulars of yearly collections from each village for three years and recommended on the Permanent Settlements.

Alexander submitted a general Abstract of the produce of his division and a new jama formed on the prepositions in his and Webb's reports and an Abstract of the 'Kham Jumma' for three years of the Zamindaris not reported by Webb. He also remarked on some Zamindaris reported by Webb as he differed with him on some points.

The Government approved on 22 October 1803 the Board's recommendations of 22 September 1803⁹³ and the Board instructed the Collector, on 17 November 1803, to implement it.

After the introduction of the Permanent Settlement, the total jama paid by the Zamindars was Rs. 7,74,080 i.e., Vizianagaram Rs. 5,00,000, Palakonda Rs. 51,000, Merangi Rs. 14,000, Kurupam Rs. 10,500, Sangamvalasa Rs. 6,700, Chemudu Rs. 5,000, Tada Rs. 3,000, Salur Rs. 36,000, Bobbili Rs. 84,000, Andra Rs. 1,380, Madugula Rs. 25,000, Golconda Rs. 10,000, Jeypore Rs. 16,000, Belgaum Rs. 10,500, Kasipuram Rs. 600, Sarvapalli-Bhimavaram Rs. 400.

Early in 1803, the Kimidi Zamindari and Tekkali haveli were transferred to Ganjam and the Vizagapatam district consisting of sixteen Zamindaris and twenty-three proprietary estates was put under a single collector, Leveston Granville Keith Murray who assumed charge on 13 May 1803.

The Company introduced Permanent Settlement during the years 1802-04 to remove "all the generated evils of unsettled principles of revenue administration" to "reform and establish it on a firm and efficient footing not less to the advantage of the people than to the security of the revenue"; suppressing "rebellion and insubordination" which was conspicuous, by 'annihilating' the troops of the Zamindars and bringing them to subjection, and "acknowledge and submit to the principle, that as they must be indebted to the beneficence and wisdom of the British Government for every advantage they were to receive, so, in like manner, they must feel

indebted solely to its protection, for the continuance and enjoyment of them”⁹⁴.

At the time of the Permanent Settlement there were sixteen Zamindaris and they were confirmed to the Zamindars in perpetuity conditionally. The assessments necessarily varied according to the extent and local conditions. As in other districts of Madras, the Government land was also brought under the Zamindari system, parcelled out into convenient estates and auctioned.

There was a fundamental condition that the Zamindars should not be allowed to retain troops, order and tranquillity being reserved by the Government. No consideration was given to these ancient Zamindars wherefore the aristocracy, so turbulent and habituated to independence, could not reconcile itself to the new power which was vigorous and determined to control them. “These Rajas are indolent, ignorant, superstitious, expensive, dissipated, haughty, suspicious of Circar Officers and they wish to consider themselves rather tributary chiefs than common subjects. Injuries, intrigues, and sometimes insults produce naturally the most violent effects on such men. Fear and suspicion particularly, and sometimes anger take possession of them; they then do something desperate, and must be considered mad. A wise Government, must if possible, prevent such explosions”⁹⁵.

Before Permanent Settlement, these Zamindars were treated as feudatories rather than as mere farmers of the revenue, ‘rather as captains of the borders, lords of the marches, chiefs of the hills, than as private landholders’ and the Government was

conducted through them, some of them having the responsibility for the hill tribes⁹⁶. But now, they were stripped of the ruling powers, their estates were liable to attachment for default of peshkash, the British police system substituted the Zamindari one and civil and criminal 'judicatories' set up, which were complex and vexatious with the hardships, unknown in the 'good old days'.

The Collector was not the Magistrate upto 1816. The Zilla Judge held that office with duties but without means of performing them. Being stationary, he used to send his 'darogahs' who were "generally low men, such as Kotwals, turned-off writers, dubashes and butlers, the dregs of the courts and cutcherry" and their peons who were "good for nothing, batta peons, such as hang about every cutcherry and follow the dubash⁹⁷" into the Zamindaris to control the 'proud' Zamindars and to establish a good police in them. They pretending to enforcing law and order, harrassed them by exposing and exaggerating their petty transgressions. Irritated by these petty tyrannies and by the working of the new revenue and judicial codes, the Zamindars for many years after Permanent Settlement were utterly discontented. Politically this settlement failed.

Even from the view point of revenue the Permanent Settlement did not improve the matters. The Company felt the same difficulties in collecting the jama from the poor but obstinate Zamindars. On the death of Vijayarama Raju (1794) they felt it expedient to curtail the power of his successor and restored the dispossessed hill Zamindars. They had neither resources nor credit to borrow; and, in many instances, there was an illegitimate brother or a

cousin who preferred claims, gathered some following, seized a part of the country, and curtailed its resources. There were also unfavourable seasons and in this period there was practically no specie in the district. So the restored Zamindars, especially of the hills, could not punctually pay the jama and troubled the local authorities with their turbulence.

The Madras Government tried to enforce the principles of the Settlement and Regulations. They frequently instructed the Collectors not to deviate from the Regulations and emphasized "the due realization of the revenue according to the regulated Kistbundy"⁹⁸. Threats of auction and attachments were the order of the day. Aumeens and Tanadars were deputed to attach and realize the revenue. Many Zamindaris were attached several times. Though the Government strived hard not to infringe the principles of Permanent Settlement and Regulations, the 'local circumstances' in the Zamindaris and continued dislocation in the district did not permit them to be vigorous. The Permanent Settlement was introduced at an unfavourable time and in hurry. The low price of grain, want of specie, stagnation of the Company's investment, adversity of seasons, internal feuds in the hill Zamindaris, their strong posts, the fatal climate of the hills, the inadvertency and indolence of the Zamindars in general and the obstinacy of the hill Zamindars in particular contributed to the failure of the Permanent Settlement.

In June 1819 the Government, considering the 'unusual cheapness of grain', 'the operation of the rules of present in force for realizing arrears' of assessment by the sales which enriched diwans and

money lenders who were highly usurious to the Zamindar who sought to save his estate and other difficulties, prohibited the sales. In their letter dated 17 June 1819 they directed the Collector to "attach the whole or part of such ancient Zamindaries of which the revenue may fall in arrears but will not proceed to sell any part of any ancient Zamindari till the pleasure of the Governor-in-Council shall have been communicated on the reference which the Board will make of each case of default in such Zamindaries"⁹⁹. Formerly, when there was no prohibition, the Zamindars who were always in mortal fear of loss of their hereditary possessions which checked their extravagance, paid the kists with "as much punctuality as was necessary and were therefore more easy in circumstances, more independent and comfortable than they have been since the period at which they were led to consider their estates as unalienable"¹⁰⁰. But when they knew this prohibition, many Hill Zamindars evaded the kists and squandered the money before the Collector sequestered their Zamindaris and deputed an aumeen to collect the revenue from the ryots. Despite the Collector and his aumeen, the Zamindar still collected kists; and he could not be checked, "for every ryot knows that the consequence of disregarding the Zamindar's orders in such matters will be the plunder of his property, the burning of his house and perhaps personal imprisonment and outrage"¹⁰¹. These Hill Chiefs dominated the cultivators fully, and, the extremely unhealthy climate, inaccessible nature of the country and loyalty of the inhabitants to their hereditary chiefs prevented the aumeen "to collect one rupee without the concurrence of the Zamindar"¹⁰². This weakened the Govern-

ment more than the former system of nominally attaching a Zamindari. When the aumeen used to attach the estate, they were bribed away. Thus the zuft aumeen was an "imposition of a fine" ¹⁰³ which harrassed the Zamindar. When the Zamindars misused the indulgence, the Government to show that they were "resolved to realize the peshcush even by sale of the Zamindaries and that they were able if necessary to ensure a sale by purchasing and keeping them in their own hands" ¹⁰⁴ and to have a salutary effect on the other Zamindars sold Madugula.

Sir Thomas Munro, Governor of Madras, in a minute of 7 January 1823 written after a tour of the Circars, summed up the then position as under ¹⁰⁵.

"The weakness of the authority of Government in the Circars is owing to our restoring the district to the petty Zamindars, who had been subdued, contrary to the opinion of the Committee of Circuit; to our erecting by the Permanent Settlement a new set of proprietary Zamindars; to our not reserving a single village in which we could exercise direct control over the ryots; and to our transferring to these proprietors the karnams, who are the source of all information. In open countries long under the immediate authority of Government, the Permanent Settlement, though it tends to conceal the real state of the country, does not seriously affect the public authority by encouraging resistance or rebellion; but in mountainous unhealthy districts like the Northern Circars, the greater part of which has long been in the hands of a number of petty Rajas, some claiming independence and all constantly ready to withhold their tribute and to raise disturbances whenever they

see a favourable opportunity, the Permanent Settlement has the effect of weakening the authority of Government over the whole province, and of rendering the establishment of security and of good border more difficult than before... our system in the Circars is one of forbearance, and we are obliged to connive at irregularities which would not be tolerated in other provinces, lest we should be compelled to use force and involve ourselves in a petty warfare against banditti in a pestilential climate among hills and jungles.

“The affairs of the Circars can never be well administered, nor the great body of the people protected against oppression, nor the country be secured from disturbance and the incursion of plunderers, until our Government becomes more respected in those provinces than it is at present...No Zamindari once forfeited for rebellion should ever be restored, whatever temporary evil the retention of it might occasion. All estates falling in should invariably be kept and annexed to the sirkar lands...The gradual extension of the sirkar lands should be our main object, because it is by having the direct possession and management of landed property that we can best protect the ryots, grant them remissions of rent, assist them in agricultural improvements and attach them to our Government”.

Throughout this period, the Zamindars, chafing at their reduction as mere landholders and, aided by a wild and unhealthy country, kept the district in continual ferment with their recalcitrance and feuds. The disturbances, which entirely resulted from their own feuds, impoverished them and made them defaulters.

So the Government which had to establish tranquillity proceeded to chastise them and destroy their strongholds. But the unhealthy climate and the 'desultory warfare', hampered it. As early as 1811 martial law was proclaimed in Palakonda and Srungavarapukota. Despite the efforts of the Government to 'hunt down' the rebels, the rebellions persisted. Between 1828-1832 insurrection broke out in the southern and central parts. Disgruntled parties began to plunder and foment disturbances. Scenes of a similar nature, "though originating in different circumstances were acting in other quarters also and many of the Zamindars, taking advantage of the distraction which prevailed, and believing that the indulgence, shown by Government in forbearing to enforce the payment of their tribute by the sale of their lands, originated in the consciousness that they could neither support a new proprietor, nor manage them successfully by means of their own officers, appropriated their revenues to the gratification of their personal pleasures, and left the public demand to accumulate"¹⁰⁶. At the end of Fasli 1242 the arrears of the Zamindaris were very large. Narayana Raju of Vizianagaram could not manage his Zamindari and handed it over to the Collector.

Towards the close of the year 1832, the disturbances reached the climax and the Government deployed a large force. George Russell, the First Member of the Board of Revenue, was appointed Special Commissioner in December 1832 to ascertain the cause of insurrection, devise and carry out measures for their suppression and to recommend "what future course he thought best suited to prevent

their recurrence". He was invested with extraordinary powers including that of proclaiming Martial Law, if necessary. His report is dated 18 November 1834.

The chief instigators were Kakerlapudy Jagannadha Raju called also Sitarama Raju and Mookee Veerabhadra Raju. After the death of Venkatapati Raju, the Zamindar of Palakonda in 1828, feuds arose in the family.

In the southern part the disturbances were conducted by Jagannadha Raju, "a cousin of the Zamindar of Cottah and Ramachandrapooram in the Zillah of Rajahmundry", who claimed the ancient Pykarow Zamindari in this district on behalf of his son, a boy of about ten or eleven years of age who "he said was distantly related to" and adopted by one of the last lineal descendants¹⁰⁷.

Uppalah Pykarow, the son of the Zamindar, possessed Satyavaram and Anakapalli districts when the Circars were ceded. He died in October 1776¹⁰⁸ issueless, but leaving two widows, Seetiah and Rajiah; and so the country was made over to Vijayarajama Raju, to whom the deceased was indebted, on the condition that he should pay annually into the public treasury¹⁰⁹ Rs. 90,000 besides his former tribute, and Rs. 10,000 for the subsistence of the widows. Seetiah died in 1804. Rajiah was deranged mentally and became the prey of needy distant relations who contracted debts in her name, and forged her signature for adoption. But as her imbecility disproved the adoption, the Government decided that it should lapse with her life. She died in October 1814.

When the Permanent Settlement was formed in 1802-3 the districts of Satyavaram and Anakapalli were sold along with the other Haveli lands and purchased by the Raja of Vizianagaram, who in 1810 transferred them by private agreement to Goday Suryaprakasa Row. In January 1832 Jagannadha Raju alias Seetarama Raju, a cousin of the adoptee who died earlier, provided with armed followers, assumed the title of Pyakarow proceeded to commit depredations and exacted contributions. The Acting Collector, Smith, in his letter to the Board of Revenue dated 24 July 1832, attributed these disturbances to the 'unconciliatory spirit' and unpopularity of the proprietors of the estate in that neighbourhood, and particularly of Goday Suryaprakasa Row and his brother Narrain Row¹¹⁰. But Russell, after enquiry, concluded that the Acting Collector was mistaken and that "it was not an insurrection of the people, arising from personal dislike or attachment to an individual. The inhabitants generally had no connection with the rebel faction, and though compelled to purchase safety for themselves and families by contributing to their wants, and deterred from giving information through fear of their resentment, were yet not interested in their success"¹¹¹. Jagannadha Raju who led the insurrection, had no influence, but was a mere puppet of Naganna Dora, the diwan and "the person possessing the entire influence of the Golgondah Zamindari which is the hill country bordering on the disturbed parts"¹¹², in whom the Acting Collector confided and recalled the troops and committed the country to him. Naganna, by preventing open rebellion, could confirm the Acting Collector's belief in his fidelity while secretly thwarting him. The insurgents, emboldened

by success, resorted to the hills, the natural strongholds and rendered still "more so by stockades". As the Government could not subdue them otherwise, the whole district was placed under the Martial Law on 11 December, 1832¹¹³. Jagannadha Raju and his followers soon after fled into the Nizam's country. But he re-appeared at the beginning of May 1834¹¹⁴ leading adventurers collected in the Nizam's territories. Now he was deprived of the main support as Naganna Dora died. Hard pressed by the troops he escaped into the Rumpa, a hill Zamindari in the Rajahmundry district behind Golconda. The Rumpa Chief betrayed him and he was executed near Anakapalli.

The action of Russell against Mookee Veerabhadra Raju of Kasipuram and Palakonda upto 1833 is dealt with in the case studies. In January 1833 Veerabhadra Raju was captured. He was sentenced to death, but it was commuted to life imprisonment. Regarding Palakonda, where Martial Law was proclaimed, all the family members were prosecuted for complicity and were tried by a Military Court. Except the late Zamindar's second wife, who was imprisoned, all others were executed. The Zamindar and his family were exiled to Vellore and the Zamindari was forfeited.

In 1835 Sir Frederiek Adam, Governor of Madras, visited the Northern Circars and emphasized the expediency of exempting the hill Zamindaris from the general regulations. Russell also in 1837, after suppressing the Gumsur disturbances in Ganjam (which broke out at the close of 1835) which form the subject of his further Reports of 12 August 1836 and 3 March and 11 May 1837, recommended

the Agency system. He observed that "a system which was adapted to districts where the authority of Government is paramount could not fail to be inapplicable to mountainous tract, where, up to that period and after a lapse of more than thirty years, the Government had in effect no police and no power". He proposed "as the course best calculated both to add to the weight and influence of the local authority, and to remove existing causes of irritation on the part of the hill Zamindars arising from the unbending form of regulation procedure, that those tributaries should be exempted from the jurisdiction of the ordinary courts and placed exclusively under the Collector of the district, in whom should be vested the entire administration of civil and criminal justice, under such rules for his guidance as might be prescribed by order in Council". This proposal was approved and it formed the basis of Act XXIV of 1839. The tracts exempted by this Act from the general regulations were as follows :- Vizianagaram, Bobbili, Palakonda, Golgonda, which was purchased by the Government in 1837, Jeypore, Kurupam, Sangamvalasa, Chemudu, Pachipenta, Andra, Madugula, Belgaum and Merangi. It was further enacted that the Collector as Agent to the Governor, should make commitments by warrant, subject always to the approval of Government in each case.

REFERENCES

1. W. F. Firminger, The Fifth Report, p. 3.
2. Ibid.
3. 26 April 1768, MC (61 : 540-48).
4. W. F. Firminger, op. cit. p. 3.
5. D. F. Carmichael, A Manual of the District of Vizagapatam, p. 192. It will be remembered all through that Vijayarama Raju was the Zamindar and that Sitarama Raju was the de facto ruler and diwan.
6. This was achieved "partly by fair means, assisted sometimes by threats". His own internal troubles and the growing predominance of the English in Northern Circars forced Sitarama Raju to come to an agreement with the English.
7. The Circar was split into three divisions viz., (1) the territory under the control of the Pusapatis, (2) Ichchapur paragana and (3) Chicacole Haveli.
8. Parlakimidi or Kimidi is referred to in the records as Kimidi.
9. Nizam Ali tried to nullify the treaty of 1766 and assert his power and thus opened hostilities with the English,
10. There were hereditary quarrels between Vizianagaram and Kimidi Zamindars.

11. Capt. Madge to Vizagapatam, 27 November 1767, MC (59 : 1421-22).
12. Masulipatam to Madras, 25 April 1768, Mc (61 : 532-34).
13. Cotsford actually, took charge of Ganjam in 1767. But the rebellion of Narayana Deo compelled him to abandon his office and return to Madras.
14. Narayana Deo, the Raja of Chikati, the Rajas of the Mahendra Malai and others.
15. T. J. Maltby, The Ganjam District Manual, p. 90.
16. Masulipatam to Madras, 12 January 1769, M. C (65 : 19 - 20)
17. Cotsford to Madras, Ganjam Records, 1769. Quoted in T. J. Maltby, Op. Cit., p. 95. In spite of his suggestion the Madras Government continued Sitarama Raju to act as the renter of the Company's Haveli lands and it was not until 1787 that his recommendation appears to have been acted upon. At the expiration of Sitarama Raju's lease, Henry Crawford was appointed in 1787, the first Collector of the Chicacole division subject to the authority of the Chief and Council of Vizagapatam.
18. Lanka Sundaram, Revenue Administration of Northern Sarkars, J. A. H. R. s., Vol. XIII, p. 34,
19. W. Francis, District Gazetteer for Vizagapatam, Appendix IX, p. 179.

20. 24 July 1769, M. C. (65 : 368 - 69)
21. Madras Despatches, 23 March 1770 (further letter) para 77, Vol. IV, p. 1062. Quoted in Lanka Sundaram, Op. Cit., J. A. H. R. s., Vol. XIII, p. 36.
22. The cases of Kandregula Jogi Pantulu, Godey Jagga Rao, Venkatarayalu are instances in point.
23. James Mill, History of British India (London MDCCC. LVIII) Vol. IV, p. 100.
24. Lanka Sundaram, Op. Cit., J. A. H. R. s., XIII. p. 83.
25. 11 December 1775, to August 1776.
26. 11 October 1776, R. C. (3B : 356).
27. 1 November 1776, R. C. (3B : 330).
28. 1 November 1776, R. C. (3B : 328 - 335).
29. 8 February 1778 to 6 April 1780.
30. Lanka Sundaram, Op. Cit., J. A. H. R. s., Vol. XIII, p. 166.
31. 13 April 1778, v. D. R. (3682)
32. 3 April 1778, R. C. (5A : 110 - 11).
33. 10 August 1778, R. C. (6A : 470).
34. 18 August 1778, R. C. (6A : 471).
35. 6 October 1778, R. C. (6A : 654) and 11 December 1778, v. D. R. (3682 : 166 - 68).

36. Lanka Sundaram, Op. Cit., J. A. H. R. s., Vol. XV, p. 9.
37. Presidency to Vizagapatam, 6 October 1783, v. D. R., (3686 : 435-439).
38. Hugh Maxwell, the fifth member, could not take part in the investigation of the affairs owing to ill-health.
39. It consisted of the Haveli lands, the Vizagapatam farms, the Vizianagaram Zamindari, including the hill Zamindaris and the Zamindaris of Kimidi and Tekkali.
40. The Madras Government printed the Report first in 1914 because of its importance and the "Proceedings" in 1915.
41. W. F. Firminger, Op. Cit., p. 4.
42. Minute of the President, 15 March 1785, v. D. R. (3688 : 33-37) and General Reports of the B.O.R. to the Governor in council, sent Home to the Court of Directors, from 25th September 1786 to 5th October 1794 (Madras, 1871), September 1786, para 26.
43. President and Council to Vizagapatam, 30 June 1786, v.D.R. (3689 : 156-157).
44. Secretary White (Fort St. George) to Vijayarama Raju, 30 October 1788, v. D. R. (3692 : 322-324) and Governor-in - Council to the Chief and Council, 3 December 1788, v.D.R., (3692 : 379-383)
45. From 24 July 1782 to 23 March 1789.

46. Claud Russell to the Presidency, 15 June 1787, v.D.R. (3691 : 124-126); 28 March 1788, v. D. R. (3692 : 78 - 82), 19 August 1788, v. D. R. (3692 : 221-222), 1 November 1788, v. D. R. (3692 : 329-330), 5 November 1788, v. D. R. (3692 : 336-337), 22 November 1788, v. D. R. (3692 : 369), 12 December 1788, v. D. R. (3692 : 405-406), 16 December 1788, v. D. R., (3692 : 438) 20 December 1788, v. D. R. (3692 : 443-444), 22 December 1788, v.D.R. (3692 : 456-458) and 29 December 1788, v.D.R. (3692 : 515).
47. The Diwans were (1) Datla Venkata Raju (1781-86), (2) Dantaluri Sitarama Raju (1786-90), (3) Datla Venkatapati Raju (April 1790 to October 1790), (4) Pusapati Sitarama Raju (October 1790 to November 1791), (5) Venkatapati Raju (November 1791 to January 1793) and (6) Pusapati Sitarama Raju (January 1793 to June 1793).
48. Vide Chapter IV.
49. 30 August 1783, v.D.R. (3686 : 384-386).
50. Vijayarama Raju to the Chief, 21 February 1788, v.D.R. (3692 : 43-44).
51. Chief to the Raja, 5 July 1793, v. D. R. (3696 : 286-287)
52. 26 August 1793, v.D.R. (3696 : 402).
53. 26 August 1793, v.D.R. (3696 : 401-404).
54. 21 October 1791 to 20 November 1794.
55. 20 September, 7 October 1793 and 15 February

- 1794, General Reports of the B.O.R., paras 30, 20, 51.
56. Diary of Snow, 31 December 1793, v. D. R. (3698 : 59)
 57. 25 July 1794, v. D. R. (3701 : 82-83).
 58. 25 March 1794, v. D. R. (3699 : 267),
 59. Vijayarama Raju to the Chief, 25 March 1794, v. D. R. (3699 : 266).
 60. Intelligence from Padmanabham, 9 July 1794, v. D. R. (3700 : 349).
 61. Vijayarama Raju to Colonel Prendergast, 10 July 1794; v. D. R. (3700 : 355).
 62. General Reports of the B.O.R. from 10th February 1795 to 15th September 1800 (Madras, 1871), 10 February 1795, paras 106-107.
 63. B. O. R. to the Chief, 12 November 1794, v.D.R. (3703 : 212-17).
 64. 10 February 1795, General Reports of the B. O. R. para 115.
 65. General instructions to the Collectors, Ibid., paras 116 - 126.
 66. Webb to B. O. R., Ibid., para.138.
 67. Ibid., paras 138 - 139.
 68. Government to B. O. R., Ibid., paras 145 - 147.
 69. B. O. R. to Government, Ibid., para 142.

70. Webb to B. O. R., 5 January 1797, B. O. R. C., p. 77.
71. Webb to Snow, 16 March 1795, v. D. R. (3704A : 147).
72. Webb to B. O. R., 5 January 1797, B. O. R. C., p. 77
73. 31 August 1795, General Reports of the B. O. R., para 88.
74. Webb to B. O. R., 22 June 1795, Ibid., paras 86, 87.
75. Webb to B. O. R., 5 January 1799, B. O. R. C., p. 78
76. Webb to Snow, 16 March 1795, v. D. R. (3704A : 146)
77. Webb to B. O. R., 31 August 1795, General Reports of the B. O. R., para 89.
78. 10 January 1796, Ibid., para 52.
79. Webb to B. O. R., 13 February 1796, B. O. R. C. pp. 1776 to 1809 and 30 June 1796, General Reports of the B. O. R., paras 28, 29.
80. Government in Consultation, 30 June 1796, General Reports of the B. O. R., para 35.
81. Ibid., para 37.
82. 14 March 1796, General Reports of the B. O. R., paras 38, 39.
83. Webb to B. O. R., 30 June 1796, paras 41, 42.
84. Government to Webb, Ibid., para 43.

85. Webb to B. O. R., 28 February 1797, General Reports of the B.O.R., paras 31, 32.
86. Webb to B. O. R., 5 January 1797, B. O. R. C., pp. 76-103.
87. Government to Webb, 28 February 1797, General Reports of the B.O.R., paras 33-35.
88. 3 November 1797, v.D.R. (3710B : 671-72) and 25 January 1798, General Reports of the B. O. R., paras 25-27.
89. Orders of Government under date 4 September 1797. W. F. Firminger, Op.Cit., Appendix 18, pp. 317-18.
90. W. F. Firminger, Op.Cit., p. 51.
91. W. F. Firminger, Op.Cit., pp. 53, 316.
92. Correspondence Relative to the Permanent Settlement of Zamindaris in the late 2nd division of Vizagapatam (Madras, 1909), pp. 1-25.
93. Ibid., pp. 27-41.
94. Revenue Letter from the Court of Directors to Fort St. George, 11 February 1801. W. F. Firminger, Op.Cit., p. 51.
95. D F. Carmichael, Op.Cit., p. 223.
96. W. Francis, District Gazetteer for Vizagapatam p. 56,
97. Opinion expressed by Thackeray, Member of the Board of Revenue. Quoted in W. Francis, Op.Cit., p. 56.

98. B.O.R. to the Collector. 20 February 1811, v.D.R. (3727 : 109-11).
99. General Letter from England in the Revenue Department dated 22 May 1818, Extract from the Minutes of Consultations of the B. O. R , 17 June 1819, v.D.R. (3757 : 402).
100. Collector to B.O R., 16 August 1827, v. D. R. (4740 : 121)
101. 16 August 1827, v.D.R. (4740 : 122)
102. Ibid.,
103. Collector to B. O. R., 28 April 1838, v. D. R. (6642 : 271-75)
104. Sub - Collector to B. O. R., 15 October 1834, v.D.R. (4746 : 359-60).
105. 5 January 1824, General Reports of the B. O. R, paras 1236-1241. W. Francis, Op.Cit., p. 57 and 5 January 1839, v.D.R., (6643 : 3-6).
106. G. E. Russell, Reports on the Disturbances in Parlakimedy, Vizagapatam and Goomsoor, in 1832-36 (Madras, 1856), Vol. I, pp. 6-7.
107. Collector to B. O. R., 24 July 1832, v. D. R. (4744 : 305-14).
108. G. E. Russell, Op.Cit., p.5.
109. Government to the Chief and Council, 11 December 1778 (3682 : 167).
110. 24 July 1832, v.D.R. (4744 : 305-14).
111. G. E. Russell, Op.Cit. p.5.
112. Acting Collector to B. O. R., 24 July 1832, v.D.R., (4744 : 309).
113. G. E. Russell, Op. Cit., p. 6.
114. Collector to B. O. R., 26 May 1834, v. D. R. (4746 : 155).

CHAPTER IV

The Vizianagaram Zamindari

The Pusapati family of Vizianagaram, the most ancient and distinguished family, played a crucial role in the history of Vizagapatam district. The early history of the family is obscure.

The earliest account of its development as a power in the Chicacole Circar is outlined in Edward Cotsford's Letter of 13 January 1777 to the Court of Directors of the East India Company¹. The account of the family as given by James Grant in his 'Political Survey of the Northern Circars' dated 20 December 1784² is cursory. D. F. Carmichael's 'A Manual of the District of Vizagapatam' published in 1869 traced the history of the family very briefly upto the times of 'Pedda' Viziarama Raju. The only other chronicle available is in the Mackenzie MSS, which is incorrect in several matters admitting of the necessity of check and absence of dates and therefore it is unreliable. As the Letter of Cotsford was the earliest of all these, his account is followed here supplemented by the material available in the contemporary Fort St. George Records of the period.

The founder of the family was Pusapati Madhavavarma, who took the dynastic title from his native village of Pusapadu, near Kondapalli in the Krishna District. In 1652 he entered into the Chicacole Circar as a "Sirdar" of Sher Muhammad Khan, the first Faujdar from 1652 to 1682. In 1655 he obtained from him a lease of the 'contry' of Kumile

and Bhogapuram for which he paid per annum Rs. 5,207-12-9. He 'removed' himself with his family from Pusapadu and resided at Bhogapuram. In 1685 he died and his son Sitaramachandrudu succeeded him.

In 1690 Mustapha Kulikhan, the next Faujdar (1682-1697) recognising his services in capturing the Vizagapatam factory³, granted him the 'districts' or 'purgannahs' of Gunderu, Devupalli, Potnuru, Nellimarla, Velagada, Madhuravada, Gudipudi and Anantagandhavaram and twenty - one villages for which he paid annually Rs. 78,244-10-6. He was also allowed to keep 125 horse and 450 foot. With his 'disrespectable' attitude the Faujdar fell out with the Zamindars. In 1694 they, led by Sitaramachandrudu, defeated him and "have shut up the Seerlascar in Chicacole ffort, from whence he cannot escape nor has force enough to oppresse than unlesse the king send an Armeý to his assistance"⁴. In March 1695 there was 'an accommodation', "wherein the Seir Lasscar doth condescend to dishonourable terms..."⁵ and "the Rajahs are now more Governors than the Moors of the Country"⁶. In 1696 Sitaramachandrudu died and was succeeded by Annam Raju, who died six months later and was succeeded by Tammiraju (Timmaraju).

In 1697 the Faujdar endeavouring to regain his credit and reduce the Rajas renewed the quarrel. In October 1697 he was killed in an engagement⁷. Tammiraju died in 1699 and was succeeded by Venkatapati Raju. But "being a sickly person and not being able to manage the country he left it to the care of" his brother Ananda Raju. He received from the Faujdar, Mohadin Khan (1700-1701) three

villages at Rs. 1,410 annually. In 1701 Rustumdilekhan (1701-04), appointed for the second time added the 'districts' of Sambam and Paleru and five 'villages' to the rents of Ananda Raju for which he paid annual tribute of Rs. 20,422. He was lenient to the Zamindars and friendly to Ananda Raju and Raghunatha Raju of Jeypore.

In 1710 Habib Khan (1710-1717) came out as the Faujdar. During his period 'revolutions of the country are much encreased'. He was in "continuall warr with the Rajas, plundering and destroying wherever he comes". Ananda Raju was the first member of the Pusapati family to make friendship with the Company^o. In 1713 he started the construction of the Fort of Vizianagaram which was later on completed by Pedda Vijayarama Raju. Ananda Raju died in 1717 and Pedda Sitarama Raju, the son of his brother Venkatapati Raju, succeeded him. Ananda Raju's son, Pedda Vijayarama Raju, assisted him.

In 1717 Sitarama Raju received from Arabi Khan (1717-20) three districts and Kaniti, Pudimadaka, Gangavaram, Vaddepudi and some other villages for which he paid annual tribute of Rs. 20,068-12-0. In 1720 Maula Khan (1720-24) gave three 'districts' and several villages in rent at Rs. 54,591 per annum. In 1725 Anvaruddin Khan (1725-40) granted him three villages for which he paid Rs. 2,217-0-0 annually. In 1731 differences arose between the two brothers and "by private resolution Sitarama Raju managed Deopilly and ca Talloks and Vijayarama Raju Potnur, Bhogapuram & ca Talloks"¹⁰ for two years. In 1734 Sitarama

attained majority, succeeded him. Ananda Raju was also equally powerful. From the beginning he was hostile to the French. After his quarrel with Bussy¹³, he seized Vizagapatam from the French on 2 September 1758 and invited the English to co-operate with him in driving away the French from the Circars. He made a treaty with the English on 15 November 1758 famous as 'Vizianagaram Treaty'¹⁴ as a sovereign power. After securing the co-operation of Clive, who despatched Colonel Forde, he fought the decisive battles of Chandurti on 7 December 1758 and Masulipatam on 7 April 1759 and expelled the French from the Circars. The English acquired a large tract¹⁵. Clive utilized this acquisition to procure from the Emperor Shah Alum the 'Firmaun' for the Northern Circars, dated 12 August 1765 and consequently "it was to Ananda Raju that the British owe the cession of these provinces"¹⁶.

On 11 April 1759 Ananda Raju sent detachment "as a Van Body & took the Fort of Cheacole & imprison'd the Naib of the Phousdar there & Hoisted Ye English Flag on it"¹⁷. He ruled from Chicacole to Rajahmundry¹⁸. Thus the territory under Vizianagaram was the largest and its power the highest. But before he could consolidate it, assert for an adequate compensation from the Company for his services and fight for the due status of Vizianagaram, he died on 25 February 1760 at Rajahmundry at the very tender age of twenty. In his premature death and in the steady rise of the British, Vizianagaram lost the race.

Thus subject to occasional vicissitudes, the power of the Pusapatis steadily increased during the

first century of its existence. Their own dominions and those of their feudatories covered an area "conterminous with the present district. Their tenure of this extensive country was that of a tributary prince"¹⁹.

After the death of Ananda Raju, Chandrayya, the widow of 'Pedda' Vijayarama Raju, adopted Venkatapati Raju, a boy of twelve, the second son of her husband's cousin, Pusapati Ramabhadra Raju of Tallapalem, naming him Vijayarama Raju after her husband. In April 1760²⁰ the Nizam, Salabat Jang, proclaimed him 'Rajah' of Vizianagaram and gave him a 'sunnud'. The 'peshcush' was Rs. 2,90,059-4-0. Gundala Appaji Raidoo, the Diwan, under her instructions, transacted all this business. The Zamindaris of Sringavarapukota, Salur, Madugula, Jeypore, Kottapalem, Kurupam, Anakapalli and Satyavaram, Golgonda, Palakonda, Andra, Regula-
valasa, Poram, Tada, Sangamvalasa, Chemudu, Rajam and Narava were tributary to Vizianagaram.

At the time of Vijayrama Raju's accession, Sitarama Raju, his half brother, older by seven years, "judging he had the best claim to the country", troubled him for one year. Venkatakrishnama Raju, his maternal uncle, led a large army to support his claim to the 'Rajaship' and Vengal Row was ravaging for his own benefit. The diwan Gundala Appaji Raidoo "not being on good terms" with Sitarama Raju kept the brothers separate and proceeded against Rajam, but, failing in his attempts and thinking that Sitarama Raju "being at variance with his brother proved injurious to the management of the affairs of the country", conciliated them²¹.

Vijayarama Raju was acknowledged as the 'Raja' and Sitarama Raju became the 'de facto' ruler as diwan in 1761. For over thirty years, his influence was predominant, and Vijayarama Raju 'crouched' under his 'dominion' and even the 'oppression'.

In 1761 Sitarama Raju finding himself cramped by the dowager, Chandrayya, put her to death after confining her in Devapalli²². He then dismissed Appaji Raidoo. He was supported by Saugy Narayana Raju²³, 'Meer Bakshi' and the 'Khilledar' of Vizianagaram. Vijayarama Raju, being young and weak, was a silent spectator. Even though there were some murmurings in some quarters, Sitarama Raju by his dexterity and duplicity established his own power.

After consolidating his position among the members of the darbar (court), Sitarama Raju sent some 'proper' persons to Vengal Row²⁴ at Rajam to negotiate with him. He reconciled him by allowing him to retain Rajam and Kaviti at Rs. 20,000 annually. In 1761 he seized Parlakimidi and in 1762 after the battle of Narasannapeta most of the Zamindari came under Vizianagaram²⁵. In 1763 he sent his brother Vijayarama Raju with an army to Itchapore and Ganjam to collect in the 'Ordra' country and himself proceeded to Rajahmundry and removed the local 'Nabob' Baddi Abjama Khan and occupied it.

At Itchapore, Jumpana Jagannadha Raju and Gundala Sitanna persuaded him to quarrel with his brother. Sitarama Raju, on hearing this, deputed Sirdar Ibrahim Beg²⁶ who escorted his brother to Rajahmundry, and the two brothers were reconciled. In 1764 they captured Samalkota and went as far

as Mogaltore and made collections. The Pusapatis held the Rajahmundry Circar till May 1765 when they under the pressure of circumstances delivered it to the English. During that year Vengal Row died and the Rajam fort was taken and Chinna Ranga Row was imprisoned.

From 1758 to 1763, owing to "concurrent circumstances" Sitarama Raju evaded the payment of revenue; but, Nizam Ali Khan, who arrived at Rajahmundry about 1763 demanded arrears; and, as a compromise, he engaged to pay twenty lakhs of rupees of which he paid about seven lakhs only. In 1765 Hussain Ali Khan received from the Nizam 'sunnud'²⁷ for the Northern Circars which occasioned hostilities between him and Sitarama Raju regarding Chicacole. However, it was given up ultimately to Sitarama Raju, who relinquished the Rajahmundry and Ellore Circars "where he had gained some footing, during the late confusion"²⁸. In 1766 he engaged to pay for this Circar five lakhs of rupees.

When the Government at Madras proceeded to manage the Circars, being unacquainted with them, they were obliged to confide in Sitarama Raju and allow him to take the 'countries' at a lesser rent. The situation obliged him to maintain large force to control the Zamindars and as and when necessary he was assisted by the Company.

In 1769 the hill Zamindars, who in 1762 joined the Marathas, became recalcitrant. The combination was formidable, but he could rise to the occasion. He persuaded the Chief and Council to regard it "as a challenge to their newly constituted authority"²⁹ and aided by the Company he dispossessed

all of them except the Andra and Palakonda Zamindars. This assistance 'enlarged' and 'confirmed' his authority greatly, for under the pretext of serving the Company 'he established an unlimited authority over many of the Zamindars, who in the nature of their tenure, were not dependant on him farther than to pay their tribute to him as the Company's renter'"³⁰.

The chaos in the Carnatic in 1768 and disturbances of Narayana Deo in the Chicacole Circar obliged the Governor and Council to respond to the demands of Sitarama Raju. They on 27 March 1769 confirmed the 'Grant of Jaghire' of Rs. 24,000 per annum upon Vijayarama Raju in Madugula, Nandapuram and Srungavarapukota ³¹. These acquisitions at a lesser rent enhanced his authority "not from the quantity but from the mode in which the Grant is made"³². In 1769 he rented the Chicacole haveli and got footing in the Anakapalli Zamindari standing security for its tribute. In 1770 he also stood security for Kimidi and interfered in its management up to the end of 1774.

During the period of confusion in Kimidi in 1771 Sitarama Raju occupied a 'district' of it, called 'Gunniporam' which had a value of Rs. 60,000 and transferred it to Vikrama Deo, Nandapuram Zamindar's brother, in return for a pass of Salur Ghat, called 'Saureacca', "one of the entrances into the Chicacole Circar from the Territories of the Marathas. This district joins to the Country of Nundaporam, and was much desired by Vickramadoo. The advantages to Sitarama Raju from having this pass speaks for itself" ³³.

Before Sitarama Raju transferred 'Gunniporam' to Vikrama Deo, they were not on good terms, and their reconciliation lasted no longer than it suited the interest of Sitarama Raju. In 1774, he spread a false report that the Marathas behind the pass would enter the Circar at the invitation of Vikrama Deo and others. He also urged that the Circar would never be secure there until Vikram Deo was dispossessed of the forts near the pass. He sought to get them on other grounds and obtained them³⁴.

In 1775 assisted by the Company, Sitarama Raju dispossessed him of the 'District' of 'Gunniporam', compelled him to flee to the hills, took Royagad, Narrainpatam and Vistana Cotah and was about to take Jayapuram. Now he commanded Nandapuram and "increased his consequence with the Marathas, Rents, Havelly and all the Zamindaries" except Tekkali came under his control. He became the collector of the revenue of the countries dependant on Vizagapatam, save Rs. 20,000 of Tekkali. Thus the Company's position, the power of the Pusapatis and the turbulence of hill Zamindars had interacted; and the Company had to depend upon Sitarama Raju and allow his rise.

From 1761 to 1775 Sitarama Raju was supreme both in internal and external affairs of Vizianagaram. Internally he was not challenged by the leading 'Rachavars' and externally he had Company's support. Instead of utilizing this favourable position to limit the military activities to necessary extent and improve the finances of the Zamindari, he, being of "a daring, violent, restless and turbulent disposition"³⁵, misusing his 'unlimited authority'³⁶,

pursued "a career of unchecked annexation"³⁷ and diverted the revenues for his ambitions. He became unpopular and contemptible rapidly.

The activities of Sitarama Raju to fulfil his ambitions prompted the Company to feel strongly that their interests suffered. The Company increasingly realized the need of local knowledge of the country in detail and direct relations with the hill Zamindars to curb him and establish their authority firmly to draw revenue proportionate to the value. Sitarama Raju despite his charge of 'total management' and the "whole revenue", was irregular in his payments and frequently excused himself. By 1773, his arrears accumulated to Rs. 3,00,000. This spurred the Government of Alexander Wynch (2 February 1773- 11 December 1775) to vigorous action. Sitarama Raju's agency was convenient but could not be suffered for ever. Hence, they ordered a minute inquiry into the whole matter. The inquiry revealed that Sitarama Raju's connections with the hill rajas were strong and he could foment a general uprising. On the other hand, "he had rais'd his power to such a degree, that any attempt... to reduce it, by settling with the hill Rajahs independently wou'd be attended with many difficulties". So they could not systematize revenue collection and preferred to await an opportunity. They had the opportunity in 1775 when the power politics of Vizianagaram Court reached the climax to the detriment of the power and prestige of the Pusapati family.

The internal administration of Sitarama Raju was harsh. He controlled Vijayarama Raju and the leading 'Rachavars' strictly. A rival group headed by Jumpana Jagannadha Raju came into fore. He

was a close relative of the family, and, according to local records, he was Vijayarama Raju's father-in-law. In 1769 he was 'the Raja's diwan'³⁸ and was under the control of Sitarama Raju. Being overshadowed, he intrigued with Vijayarama Raju to remove him. But the watchful Sitarama Raju foiled him, maintained good relations with his brother and concentrated all important matters in himself. Jagannadha Raju, at last proposed, in 1774, that Sitarama Raju should resign and that Sitarama Raju's son, Narasimha Gajapati Raju, should be nominated successor in whose name the business should be carried on.

Sitarama Raju acquiesced in this and Jagannadha Raju became the diwan. Vijayarama Raju relied upon him completely without realizing his sinister and selfish views³⁹. Gradually he began to consolidate his power. In 1776 he became the 'manager' of Anakapalli Zamindari. He appropriated the "Zamindaries of Rentasima, Lovasima and Naravasima to himself"⁴⁰. He became neglectful and the jama was not regularly paid. Differences of opinion cropped up between him and Vijayarama Raju. He, observing that Vijayarama Raju "in consequence of the late accusations against him, had not shown him so much favour as heretofore, and had declared he would discharge him from serving as Diwan"⁴¹, utilized Sitarama Raju's "perplexed situation" and made 'advances' for reconciliation. They soon 'leagued together' to reduce the Raja to dependence on them. Jagannadha Raju reconciled the brothers.

Soon after the reconciliation, Sitarama Raju managed to replace Jagannadha Raju and recover

his former influence. He revived his obnoxious activities, and, in June 1777, he seized and threatened Jagga Rao, the Company's interpreter who was proceeding to Madras on his private affairs with the Company's passport, as he apparently did not recommend his actions to the Chief and Council, in "an open violation" of the Company's protection⁴². On hearing from the Chief, Vijayarama Raju agreed to permit him to proceed to Madras. Sitarama Raju "openly" rescued Jagannadha Raju who was under the control of the Company's troops for an accusation of him by Vijayarama Raju and confined him and his brother⁴³. Considering it to be "a transaction of a very extraordinary nature", the Chief demanded his release as he was in their protection, being the renter of Chicacole haveli and manager of Anakapalli Zamindari and ordered him to proceed to the Presidency.

Though Vijayarama Raju released Jagannadha Raju aftersometime, under the baneful influence of Sitarama Raju he augmented his troops, strengthened the forts of Anakapalli and Vizianagaram and recruited available Europeans without assigning to the Chief and Council any reasons. Besides all this, the non-cooperation of Vijayarama Raju with the Committee of Circuit⁴⁴ prompted the Chief and Council to conclude that he was belittling the Company and they requested the Government to take steps "to preserve tranquillity of this Circar, investments and revenues secured". To restore the 'insulted' authority, the Government ordered Vijayarama Raju to deliver Vizianagaram fort and to proceed to Madras forthwith. Vijayarama Raju being convinced that "a prompt obedience to the commands of the

Government as the only method left for preserving him from destruction" surrendered the fort to Col. Braithwaite on 17 August 1777. Sitarama Raju's schemes for raising disturbances were also frustrated⁴⁵. Thus the negative role played by Sitarama Raju and Jagannadha Raju provided the first breakthrough to the Company to establish their authority in the Circar and marked the beginning of the submission of Vizianagaram.

After the surrender of the Fort, Sitarama Raju proceeded to Madras to influence and regain the favour of the Government and Jagannadha Raju followed suit. "Both were men of ability and equally so of intrigue; they were both competitors for the control of Vijayarama Raju and the management of the Zamindari; and both equally unscrupulous in taking advantage of every favourable opportunity to provide for their own interests...⁴⁶". Sitarama Raju could win over the Governor, Rumbold, and Jagannadha Raju was declaimed and discredited. Disappointed and disgusted he went to Hyderabad and soon after died there ⁴⁷.

Vijayarama Raju expressed his "strong dislike to Sitarama Raju's renting the havelly"⁴⁸. He represented to the Chief and Council that his brother "managed my affairs for many years at his own accord, delivered them over to me about two years past encumbered with an enormous debt"⁴⁹. He added that "for 14 years past my brother Sitarama Raju confined me, as if a prisoner, in my own fort and took upon him the sole management of all my affairs, moreover the injuries and insults he rendered me during this interval, are greater than I can recapitulate, Knowing his temper I was induced to

dissemble and make him believe I was an insignificant person and incapable of managing my country, otherwise my life would have been in danger, but now having an inclination to take the whole management of my country, upon myself, to convince the world that I was ever capable of managing my own Affairs, I have excluded my diwan from interfering and by the almighty's favour, I manage all my business myself and find by experience that it is not a weight upon me. When I reflect on the hardships I have suffered from my brother it can never enter my thoughts to reconcile myself with him during my life, or to live under his management as I did before. If you and the Company wish to see my life prolonged, you must drop all thoughts of our union. On the contrary, if you and the Company are averse to my existence then you may do as you think proper"⁵⁰. Still the Whitehill Government granted the haveli on a ten-year lease to Sitarama Raju.

Rumbold (February 1778 - April 1780), Whitehill's successor, after setting aside the Committee of Circuit, summoned Vijayarama Raju in April 1778. Vijayarama Raju pleaded his inability pointing out his poverty which would be aggravated by his absence. He offered to settle with the Chief and Council for any reasonable jama. He complained to him of his brother's evil designs. But Rumbold repeated the summons and directed his re-instatement as diwan. To this the Raja expressed the "greatest aversion". At this Rumbold warned him thus: "We are convinced that it is a measure which your own welfare and the interest of the Company render indispensably necessary. But should you continue obsti-

nately to withstand the pressing instances that have repeatedly been made to you by the Board, conjunctively as well as separately, we shall be under the necessity of taking such resolutions as will in all probability be extremely painful to you, but which, being once passed can never be recalled"⁵¹. Vijayarama Raju protested: "I shall consider myself henceforward as divested of all power and consequence whatever, seeing that the Board urge me to do that which is contrary to my fixed determination, and that the result of it is to be the losing of my country"⁵². On this attitude of Rumbold, the Court of Directors, in their general letter to the Presidency of Madras dated 10 January 1781 observed: "Our surprise and concern were great on observing the very injurious treatment which the ancient Raja of Vizianagaram received at the Presidency; when, deaf to his representations and entreaties, you, in the most arbitrary and unwarrantable manner, appointed his ambitious and intriguing brother, Sitarama Raju, diwan of the Circar..... : for however necessary it might be to adopt measures for securing payment of the Company's tribute, no circumstances, except actual and avowed resistance of the Company's authority, could warrant such treatment of the Raja"⁵³. They accused the Rumbold Government of coercing Vijayarama Raju to reconcile himself to his brother, confirming his adoption of his brother's son and underselling the land by "a corrupt connivance with Sitarama Raju". For these and other offences, they dismissed Rumbold and two other members of Council, degraded several others and ordered the reconstitution of the Committee of Circuit.

After the reconciliation and re-instatement of Sitarama Raju as diwan, Vijayarama Raju proceeded

to Tirupati, Srirangam and other places. He, in his letter to the Chief dated 29 October 1778, informed that Sitarama Raju "on account of settling the country affairs and the Company's revenue business, will soon proceed to Vizianagaram, where we have both agreed to transact the business by means of my brother as formerly. Although dissensions and family differences has subsisted between me and my brother for 2 or 3 years past...we are now reconciled quite, all our differences are made up, and all our uneasiness removed. Whatever is agreeable to my brother is agreeable to me, and who sooner are his friends I consider them as mine also. I therefore request you would transact the Company's business as it may be most agreeable to my brother"⁵⁴. Having thus regained his position Sitarama Raju from 1779 to 1783 exercised unquestioned authority in Vizianagaram.

In 1799 Sitarama Raju returned to Vizianagaram from Madras and resumed all the lands that were alienated to different people. He settled the affairs of the Zamindari, "paid the Company's money, punctually discharged debts and became at ease and unembarrassed"⁵⁵. In 1781 his position was threatened by the orders of the Court of Directors for his removal. This did not materialize as the Madras Government, unanimously held that "from the power of Sitarama Raju in the Chicacole Circar, from his extensive possessions there and from his wellknown influence even in the Circars under Masulipatam, it might be attended with embarrassing consequences to attempt putting the orders of the Company immediately or strictly into execution during the present critical situation of public affairs; besides that if any

confusion should arise from an alteration of authority in the Vizianagaram family, it might possibly tempt the Nizam or other neighbouring princes to adapt a system of politics which would at this time prove very detrimental to the Company's interests"⁵⁶. They also referred to "the perfect harmony now subsisting" between the brothers and felt that "all thought of any material change in the Chicacole Circar ought for the present to be laid aside, and that every endeavour in the meantime should be used to make as large collections as possible until the beginning of the next year when the Board hope such favourable circumstances will have intervened as will render it equally practicable and more advisable to establish the Committee of Circuit and finally without risque to place the revenues of the Company on a regular and permanent footing"⁵⁷.

During this period Datla Venkata Raju acted as the manager and his brother's son Venkata Raju was Buxy. This family during Sitarama Raju's administration "not being able to provide for themselves so much as they wished", intrigued against him. In 1783 when the Committee of Circuit came into this district they persuaded him to declare to it that he wished his brother to be removed from the management⁵⁸. It was done and Sitarama Raju with his family retired to Simhachalam and Venkata Raju became the diwan. Till the sequestration of the Zamindari in 1793, Vijayarama Raju "with no inconsiderable space of good sense, and many good and amiable qualities that endear him in a particular degree to the whole country,— was certainly not the representative of a man of business, from an easiness of temper, love of amusement and want of applica-

tion" and with his unsteady character, entirely depended on the diwans and the fortunes of the Pusapati family depended on the attention and integrity of the diwans⁵⁹. In 1786 Venkata Raju lost Vijayarama Raju's favour and Dantalury Sitarama Raju succeeded him. He was efficient and sincere and commanded universal respect. Everything went on well till his death in April 1790. Venkata Raju's son Venkatapati Raju was then appointed as diwan and Dantalury Padma Raju became his adviser. They mismanaged and the arrears were four lakhs of rupees. In October Sitarama Raju was again requested to manage. He paid the Company's money and demanded from the Datla family and Padma Raju repayment of the money 'alienated' by them. They repaid some and, fearing full repayment, persuaded Vijayarama Raju to dismiss him and he did so in November 1791 and Venkatapati Raju, Padma Raju and Appal Raju succeeded to his office⁶⁰.

Meanwhile, "the unsettled state of politics at Vizianagaram" reached a climax and "everything was in a state of great confusion"⁶¹. Venkatapati Raju, Padma Raju and Appal Raju again fell into arrears and the 'Raja' knowing their deceit and bad conduct once more desired Sitarama Raju to manage which he did in February 1793⁶². There were troubles among the hill people because of his "heavy and unjust demands" upon them.

Vijayarama Raju being "totally neglectful of public Business" could not pay the Company's kists in spite of the Chief's letters dated 28 February, 14 and 28 March and 1 April 1793. The Chief and Council at Vizagapatam reported to Madras "all

that has passed" and they "after taking everything into consideration" directed them in their letter dated 16 April to require Vijayarama Raju "to dismiss his brother from all concerns in the management of his country to assign an adequate portion" of his country "for the discharge of his arrears and for the payment of the Current Jumma" and to notify that "if you did not without hesitation comply with the above mentioned requisitions your whole Zamindari will be forthwith put under the Company's management"⁶³.

Vijayarama Raju in his letters of 3 April and 9 May 1793 represented to the Chief "regarding the hill troubles"⁶⁴ and his substantial financial losses and requested him to send four companies of sepoys to restore order. The Chief "after advising the Rajah to attend to the affairs of his Government more particularly than he believed he was in the practice of doing, acquainting him, that he (the chief) would make inquiry into the cause of the troubles which had arisen and that in the meantime he requested the Rajah would inform him what was the amount of his claims upon the Hill people and how long they had been due"⁶⁵. By May 1793 besides the arrears of four lakhs of rupees, Vijayarama Raju owed 5 Lakhs pertaining to the two first kists of the year. In their letter dated 3 June, the Government directed the Chief and Council "to demand once more from Vijayarama Raju the immediate payment of the arrears due by him, both old and new and the instant removal of Sitarama Raju from all management, and for this purpose, he should, we are of opinion, be ordered without delay to Vizagapatam" and to summon Vijayarama Raju to the Chiefship to

communicate its requisitions. In case of his refusal to immediate compliance the Chief and Council were instructed to demand the surrender of the Zamindari "to be held by the Company until their demands upon it are fully discharged"⁶⁶. To implement this resolution the Government also gave directions "for assembling a detachment in Vizagapatam District...to be commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Prendergast..."⁶⁷. Though Vijayarama Raju did not reply to the Chief's letter dated 11 June, he dismissed Sitarama Raju who arrived at Vizagapatam on 22 June. In his letter of 29 June⁶⁸ Vijayarama Raju, replying to the Chief's letters dated 11, 13, 22 and 27 June, acquainted him of his departure and arrived on 2 July⁶⁹ at Vizagapatam and visited him next day. In his conversations on 3 July and in his letter of 4 July he urged the Raja to "immediately discharge the arrears", both old and new amounting to Rs. 8,50,000⁷⁰. Vijayaramaraju in his letter of 4 July, explained his difficulties and proposed to pay the amount of one kist 'in fifteen days from this date . and by 7 August the amount of the 2nd kist, the 3rd and 4th kists that will become due on account of this year I shall pay by 18 February next. The old Balance deducting the amount of the Sea and land customs due to me, the remainder I shall begin to pay from next year"⁷¹. As his proposals did not "announce" his 'acquiescence in what' was "desired from" him, the Chief sent the Governor's letter containing the resolution of sequestration⁷². On 7 July Vijayarama Raju sent his diwan Venkatapati Raju with the 'proposition' that "in the course of one month from the present date he will pay the full amount of the two kists due being Rs. 4,50,000 and one lack of the arrears in all

Rs. 5,50,000 in three equal payments". The Board at Vizagapatam considering that "it is such a one as merits attention" agreed to the proposal upon the following considerations, "that it be delivered in writing", that he must be punctual and that their decision was subject to the 'determination' of the Government⁷³. But the Madras Government in their letter dated 23 July disapproved this and directed the Chief and Council to occupy the Zamindari⁷⁴ and ordered the removal of Sitarama Raju to Madras. "The Gates of the Fort of Vizianagaram were delivered upto Colonel Prendergast on the evening of 5 August 1793"⁷⁵ and the "sequestration of the Vizianagaram Zamindari" commenced on 9 August 1793⁷⁶.

After sequestration the Zamindari was divided into three divisions and the Chief and Councillors took charge of them under the designation of Collectors. On taking charge the Collectors exerted "their utmost endeavours towards the realization of the current revenue, consistent with the existing engagements" between the Raja and his tributaries and renters and collected the balance due from them. They also strived to relieve the country from the incursions of the hill chiefs by conciliating them and reducing the Raja's regular sepoys. By 16 February 1794 they "received upwards of Rs. 6,60,000"⁷⁷. As the existing cowles would expire in January, the Board of Revenue in their letters dated 9 and 11 January 1794 authorized the Chief and Council in their separate capacity to receive offers for reletting the 'purgunnahs' in the Zamindari for three years to commence from February 1794⁷⁸. Accordingly they advertised throughout the Zamindari. Even though

the time to receive the proposals expired, no proposals came, "for the Renters are led to believe that the country will shortly be restored to the Rajah, and are in consequence assisting him with considerable loans in the hope of being repaid from the next year's Revenue". Ascribing "the backwardness of the Renters, and others to tender offers for the proposed Rent" to the "direct interference" of the Raja, the Board of Revenue in their letter dated 28 February 1794 directed "that the Rajah be positively interdicted from having interference whatever directly or indirectly, with the people of the Zamindari..." and enjoined the Chief and Council "to keep a watchful eye over his conduct in this respect". They also ordered "to advertise again allowing ten days for the delivery of proposals"⁷⁹. Accordingly, a second advertisement was published on 11 March fixing 21 March as the last date to tender proposals. Even to this advertisement the renters did not respond⁸⁰.

Being acquainted on 17 March with the Government's suspicion that he was influencing the renters on 23 March⁸¹ Vijayarama Raju who "has made known publicly" to the prominent renters the 'promise' of the Government at Madras "to restore...his country so soon as his arrears to the Company are discharged..." wrote a letter to the Chief stating that he persuaded them to make proposals and enclosed a representation⁸² from the "Renters and inhabitants of the Vizianagaram Zamindari" addressed to the Chief dated 28 March 1794 in which they would "rent the country from the Rajah" and give their 'Sunned' to the Company "to pay the Rajah's arrears exclusive of the duties of sea and customs due to him and this year tribute of Rs. 9,00,000 in

four payments as follows - on 12 May, 9 August, 5 November 1794 and 3 February 1795 - and agreed to pay every year thereafter the annual tribute regularly according to the usual payments". In his letter of 8 April 1794 Vijayarama Raju claimed Rs. 4,50,000 as compensation for the loss of sea and land customs in his Zamindari for 3 years and requested the Government to restore his country after the clearance of arrears.

After receiving the information about the failure of the "repeated publications", the Board of Revenue in their letter dated 8 April ordered "the removal of Vijayarama Raju and consequently of that influence which appears to us to operate so strongly against the attainment of the objects in view" and directed the Chief and Council to "communicate their determination to Vijayarama Raju and require him to prepare for his departure in fifteen days from that date", and to advertise again "for proposals allowing ten days for the delivery of them". They also authorised the Chief and Council to "proceed in making the best settlement of the Revenue... either with the head inhabitants or others willing to engage" on the failure of the advertisements and "insist upon the departure of Vijayarama Raju for Madras or Masulipatam, leaving to his option the choice of either of these places .."⁸³.

In their letter dated 18 April the Board of Revenue considered the propositions made by the late renters in their address to the Chief of 28 March as "inadmissible" and observed that their belief that "an influence having been used on the part of Vijayarama Raju and the principal renters, to prevent the delivering of any offers of rent for the

different purganaahs" was confirmed by the letter of Vijayarama Raju and the representation of the late renters. Regarding the Raja's claims to remission they desired the Chief and Council to furnish full information thereon⁸⁴.

After receiving the instructions of the Board of Revenue under date 8 April, the Chief prevailed upon the Raja to visit him in vain. As no proposals were submitted⁸⁵ for the third time, on 25 April the Chief acquainted the Raja by letter about the "rejection of the proposals of his renters dated 28 March last" and "exhorted him earnestly to fix a day for the commencement of his journey to the Southwards". Vijayarama Raju considered this "as the greatest indignity that could be offered to him" and "expressed himself convinced that his total ruin was intended". The Chief endeavoured "to expel the gloom that had taken possession of his spirits" and continued to urge him in the strongest manner to come to him "to converse together on the subject of his affairs". At last, on 30 April, he received a letter from the Raja, agreeing to wait upon him and on the evening of the following day, i.e., 1 May, he met the Chief. In his conversation the Chief urged him to leave the district and observed that "it would, tho' painful to him on the first instance, be ultimately for his advantage, and accelerate his restoration to the management of his Zamindari". Though the circumstances were "uncommonly distressing" to him, Vijayarama Raju with great reluctance, agreed to set out within three or four days and desired the Chief "in the most urgent manner, to request an increase of his allowances, and declared he could not discharge the unavoidable

demands upon him with a sum less than Rs. 30,000 per month”⁸⁶. On 6 May he visited the Chief “for the last time” to represent “the difficulty which he experienced in satisfying the demands of his attendants for arrears of pay”, and to request his assistance. He informed the Chief that “these people... threatened to detain him if their claims were not adjusted, and that it was absolutely necessary to supply them with money...”. He advanced Rs. 30,000 “for the purpose of enabling him to comply with the orders of Government”. The Raja promised to move, as fast as his strength would admit and the Chief and Council considering his ill-health expected that “he will atleast be able to reach the Masulipatam District”⁸⁷. On 7 May Vijayarama Raju moved from Vizagapatam.

Vijayarama Raju instead of proceeding southward went to Padmanabham on the plea of raising money with the assistance of his relations to satisfy his numerous followers⁸⁸ violating the directions of the Chief and Council. On hearing this, the Chief directed⁸⁹ Lt. Kennet “to march immediately to Padmanabham with such force as he thought adequate...to recall the Raja to a proper sense of his duty, and insist upon his pursuing his journey without delay...”. On 14 May he received intelligence from Padmnabham that “the Rajah was moving his family and effects, that some sepoy and cavalry who were to be paid off” by him “have been recalled and actually joined the Rajah, that the Desastuloo⁹⁰ were collecting, that promises had been made to the hill Zamindars for the purpose of conciliating them, and that it was imagined to be the Rajah’s intention to proceed to the Buster Country”. Inferring “the

Rajah's resolution to throw off his allegiance to the Company" from this intelligence, the Chief "recalled the detachment, summoned the Gentlemen of Council to return and sent advice of the matter to Lt. Col. Prendergast, and to the officers in Command of posts and detachments"⁹¹. The Raja's sepoys stationed in the Centre and Southern divisions and in the Company's pay joined him (Raja) at Padmanabham⁹². On 16 May the Chief received intelligence that "the Rajah has determined to keep his family in Padmanabham fort and that he himself will remain there and when he finds himself not capable to withstand any longer he will then do as the Bobbili family did formerly.. ..."⁹³.

From 15 May to 30 May there was no correspondence between the Chief and the Raja and the Chief kept himself acquainted with the happenings at Padmanabham. During this period there was no alteration in the situation, the Raja with his family remained at Padmanabham and Colonel Prendergast with about a battalion was encamped at 'Bimlipatam'⁹⁴. The financial position of Vijayarama Raju worsened rapidly as his sepoys pressed hard for their pay and the Madras Government refused to increase his allowance⁹⁵, and he wrote to the Chief on 31 May informing him that, "If I am relieved from the trouble of the sibbendies and you would assit me with money I will satisfy them and proceed on my journey to Madras"⁹⁶. On 3 June the Chief reiterated that the order of Governmemt for his proceeding immediately to Masulipatam or Madras "must instantly be complied with". He added that "as you represent that you are prevented by your sibbendies from proceeding on your journey, an

order will be given to Lt. Col Prendergast to remove this obstacle with as little delay as possible"⁹⁷. The Governor also wrote to the Raja on 31 May "calling him to a sense of his duty, requiring him to proceed with his common attendants only to Vizagapatam", and informed him that "orders had been sent to the Chief and Council to see justice done by full payment of arrears to his sibbendy"⁹⁸. The Chief also in his letters of 13 and 22 June 'recommended' strongly to obey the orders but Vijayarama Raju did not respond and remained at Padmanabham⁹⁹. At this, the Madras Government in their letter to the Chief of 24 June directed him to "require of the Commanding officer to proceed against him... and to use the most effectual means in his power for dispersing his people, and securing the person of the Zamindar himself and his principal adherents"¹⁰⁰. On 5 July the Chief informed the Raja that Col. Prendergast was directed to proceed to Padmanabham "to require your immediate acquiescence in what is demanded from you in the Governor's letter of 31 May"¹⁰¹. On 8 July Prendergast arrived at Boney near Padmanabham and wrote to Vijayarama Raju "that if he would proceed to Madras or Vizagapatam... the army will return to Chicacole or otherwise, that the army will march against him"¹⁰² and allowed him twenty-four hours for his departure as instructed by the Chief and Council in their letter dated 5 July¹⁰³. As there was no response within the stipulated time, he marched on the morning of 10 July at two o'clock and arrived at Padmanabham at half past five o'clock. "Finding the Raja's troops all arrived and prepared" he attacked them and after a 'Severe conflict' for about three quarters of an hour dispersed them. All the principal 'Rachawars' and

about four thousand sepoys were engaged in the battle. The Raja and many of his followers were killed¹⁰⁴. Thus ended the life of a great gentleman-ruler tragically. The battle was fateful and decisive. It undermined the power of the Pusapati family and paved the way for the Company's supremacy in Vizagapatam district.

The thirty four years' rule of Vijayarama Raju (1760-94) was an eventful period in the history of the Pusapati family. His character decided the course of the history of the district. He was extremely mild, and obliging. Like his ancestors he protested his friendship with the Company. He was not hostile to the Company, and, even at the battle of Padmanabham, he did not make any concerted attack. He utilized it to save the honour of his family. In his struggle with his brother and the Government he exhibited patience and resignation. Instead of nipping in the bud Sitarama Raju's influence, he submitted to him with "the patience of a martyr". Harassed by his powerful brother, unable to quell the discontent among the Rachavars, bereft of all power, unable to tackle the situation, he succumbed to despair and disgust and ended his life in the best possible manner. With his death in July 1794 an era ended and Vizianagaram was crest fallen. The 'theoretical sovereignty' of the Company over the Northern Circars became 'an actual fact'¹⁰⁵.

After the death of Vijayarama Raju in 1794, the Company in 1796 'established' Narayana Raju, his son, 'in a part of the kingdom possessed'¹⁰⁶ by his father fixing the jama at Rs. six lakhs. He was to pay a fixed amount of four lakhs of rupees towards arrears, "for the whole extent of the country"¹⁰⁷.

Then Narayana Raju being an infant, his 'managers' (in obedience to the orders) contracted and discharged it. This 'hardship' shattered the Vizianagaram finances and history began to repeat itself. Ever since the time this debt was contracted, the revenue was paid to the 'saucars' from whom money was borrowed again to pay the jama. Thus, Venkatapati Raju (April 1796-December 1796) who was diwan under the late Vijayarama Raju and Jumpana Jagannadha Raju (1797-1800), maternal uncle to Narayana Raju, conducted the affairs.

From 1801 to 1807, because of the inexperience of Narayana Raju, mismanagement by his diwan Saugy Ramachandra Raju (1801-11), adverse seasons and the natural calamities, the jama fell generally in arrears and the Company threatened sequestration frequently.

At the time of the Permanent Settlement despite the unsoundness of the Zamindari, Narayana Raju, rather the diwan, purchased nineteen of the twenty three estates sold by the Government. As "the net collections made by him since the introduction of the Permanent Settlement fell short of the estimated valuation on which the permanent jumma was fixed"¹⁰⁸, Narayana Raju before he sold many of them and upto 181 when the Zamindari came under the Collector, had to pay the jama for these estates from his own revenues. Besides this, he, like his father, was accustomed from infancy to great attention and parade. His relatives encouraged the extravagance of his 'extreme youth'. He purchased houses and 'Maniams' free of rent and he, to secure favour, gave presents and made purchases, amounting annually to above Rs. 50,000¹¹¹.

These disbursements were made after incurring great debt, "the grand source of the Zamindar's misfortunes". Lenders were in abundance, but upon such terms as "must brand them with eternal infamy". It is a notorious fact that in one instance alone Narayana Raju paid a European free merchant Rs. 2,70,000 in interest only, and the Collector reported to the Board of Revenue "at such a rate of interest as was I hope never heard of before"¹¹² Misfortunes began to press hard upon him. Two unproductive years left him in 'an exhausted state' and he expecting "to have his country sold and himself imprisoned" decided to accede "to any proposal that could be made, which would secure his honor, and his person from insult". So in February 1808 he concluded an agreement ¹¹³ with Ramachandra Raju, his diwan, renting the country for ten years, during which the diwan engaged to grant one lakh and fifty thousand rupees annually for his private expense, to pay the public demands punctually and at the end of the period to return the country unencumbered and the Zamindar free from debts^s inconsideration of which the diwan was "to possess unlimited authority no longer as a servant, but as master of the country"¹¹⁴, The agreement being uncommon, the diwan with 'consummate affrontery' and evil ideas in heart, inserted in it articles by which "everything was to be gained by the one and everything lost by the other party"¹¹⁵. The diwan and his joint renter 'treacherously' deceived Narayana Raju and failed to discharge the public demand in 1809 and 1810. During this period, exclusive of the public arrears of Rs. 6,14,000, the private debts of the Zamindar increased by Rs. 4,60,000 and stood at about Rs. 8,00,000, while

the sum paid for his private expense was not one half of the amount stipulated¹¹⁶. So the Board of Revenue in their letters dated 11 July and 17 August 1811 directed the Collector to attach the entire Zamindari and if necessary to sell it and allowed him to bid upto 9 lakhs for the whole¹¹⁷. In August the Zamindari was attached, in September was advertised for sale and the engagements with Ramachandra Raju were invalidated. Narayana Raju paid off the balance of Rs. 3,15,975 of the expired Fasli of four estates and the sequestration was withdrawn¹¹⁸. By the end of the year, he raised loans, liquidated the balance for Fasli 1220 together with the arrears of the former Fasli which became due in that year. Thus he obviated the sale of the Zamindari¹¹⁹.

In 1811 as soon as the sanction of Government was obtained for the indulgence of a temporary remission, Narayana Raju proceeded to regulate the affairs¹²⁰. He divided the renters into three classes: the first and principal class was for the payment of the Company's revenues, the second was "appropriated" to the gradual discharge of his private debts and the third to cover the kist of those who had become his securities. He rented out his 'talooks' to them and these renters were made over to the Company while he himself was responsible "if they should fall in arrears". They were all his renters and many his creditors, their motive for coming forward was "to save themselves, for they have not the interest of the Zamindar at heart"¹²¹. So they, instead of coming upto his expectations, misappropriated the collections and contributed to his 'ruin'¹²². As they defaulted, he had to deposit

his family 'jewels' as an additional security with the Collector until the outstanding balance of Fasli 1219 amounting to Rs. 1,50,000 was liquidated, which he did in July 1813¹²³.

As Narayana Raju mainly depended on loans for the payment of jama, his 'distresses' accumulated and in "endeavouring to extricate himself he has only plunged deeper into debt". Even though on 12 April 1814, he was irregular in the payment of his kists 'for the last two months'¹²⁴ only, his debts to his creditors in January 1814 amounted to Rs. 13 lakhs. Some of them clamoured for payment in the hope of receiving a present as hush money. Being "involved in much debt and finding no means to relieve" his 'samastanam' from his "present" embarrassments Narayana Raju laid his case before the Collector and entreated the Government to take over his Zamindari¹²⁵.

John Smith, the Collector (February 1813-June 1824), who was convinced¹²⁶ that "government can alone interpose the only effectual remedy for the salvation of the fortunes of the Zamindari" responded. In his letter dated 12 April 1814 he recommended the adoption "of the present plan" as "it promises ..the entire discharge of all private debts in five years, the regular payment of the Company's demands, and an ample provision to the Zamindar for his private expenses" and restoration of Pusapati family "to a portion of their former independence, which will have the further good effect of increasing the prosperity of the country", to the Board of Revenue¹²⁷. In their letter dated 9 May 1814 the Government approved it and on 17 June 1814 he handed over Vizianagaram to the Collector¹²⁸.

After assuming the management, the Government issued six percent bonds to pay off the creditors and became the sole creditor. All European claims were disallowed. The Collector was granted a commission of one and half percent of the net revenues for his "trouble and superintendence". Narayana Raju was granted an allowance of Rs. 80 000 per annum, and was advised greatest economy. In 1821 when the debt due stood at more than eight lakhs¹²⁹, the Government in June 1821 considering that "the further retention of the estate under the Collector's management to be a measure calculated to excite discontent and dissatisfaction" resolved to restore it "on the payment of all outstanding promissory notes and arrears up to the date of replacing the estate in the Rajah's possession"¹³⁰. Narayana Raju engaged himself in liquidating the debt and most of the sum required was raised by renting out about one fourth of the Zamindari. On 20 April 1822 the Collector restored the Zamindari¹³¹.

Despite the knowledge acquired during the Collector's management for upward of seven years of the resources of his Zamindari and the mode of conducting business¹³², Narayana Raju being extravagant and a poor administrator¹³³, in 1827 again handed over the Zamindari to the Collector and proceeded to Benares on an allowance of Rs. 1,00,000 per annum¹³⁴. His debts amounted to nearly seven lakhs and when he died at Benares in 1845, they amounted to eleven lakhs, large part of which was contracted at Benares. It was only in July 1852 the Zamindari was handed over to Vijayarama Raju III free of debt and with a surplus of two lakhs.

Thus, Narayana Raju, who had to follow the system of favourable rents and usurious loans, owing

“more to the treachery of his renters than to any fault or mismanagement of his”¹³⁵ handed over the Zamindari to the Company. He, unlike his father, being from the beginning under the control and supervision of the Company, surrendered the Zamindari to them and they managed it.

The period of Narayana Raju was an epilogue of complete submission of the Pusapati family. From Pedda Vijayarama Raju to Narayana Raju the history of the family was the history of district; but, from Narayana Raju onwards it was only a part of the history of the district. With the introduction of a new system of justice, police and administration, the family lost their political authority. With the loss of their power the Zamindars of Vizianagaram became peaceful landlords and the annals of the Zamindari lost many of their interesting features.

R E F E R E N C E S

- 1 20 December 1784, R.C, (16C : 1469-1503).
- 2 Fifth Report, Vol. II, Appendix, 13, pp. 219-222.
- 3 The 'Rashwar' mentioned was Sitarama Chandrudu, "Chittaram" of Factory Records. R.F.S.G: Letters from F. s. G., 23 October 1689, p. 65. and RFSG : Diary 7 and 10 October, 14 November and December 1689, pp. 85-87 and 96.
- 4 Records of Fort St. George (Public) Despatches to England 1694/6-1746/51. 11 Vols. (Madras Record Office 1919-32), 3 April 1695, p. 12.
- 5 R. F. S. G. : D. T. E., 6 June 1695, p. 20.
- 6 R. F. S. G. : D. T. E , 29 August 1695, p. 23.
- 7 R. F. S. G. : Letters from F. s. G., 26 October 1697, p. 16.
- 8 R. F. S. G. : D. T. E., 14 October 1712, p. 55.
- 9 R. F. S. G. : Diary, 19 August, 1714, p. 110.
- 10 25 March 1882, v. D. R. (4735 : 123).
- 11 R. F. S. G. : C. C., 23 February 1757, p. 28.
- 12 Edward Cotsford's Letter, 20 December 1784, R. C. (16C : 1472).
- 13 J. D. B. Gribble, A History of the Deccan, Vol. II, pp. 48-55.

- 14 Ananda Gajapathi III, Vizianagaram Treaty,
15 November 1758.
- 15 Treaty with Salabat Jang, 14 May 1759.
- 16 Manual of the Administration, Vol. I, p. 54.
His services were inadequately recompensed.
- 17 R. F. S. G. : C. C., 10 June 1758, p. 47.
- 18 The Raja appointed Captain Bristol, a European
in his service, Governor of this (Rajahmundry)
fortress. R. O. Cambridge, An Account of the
War in India, p. 277.
- 19 Manual of Administration, Vol. I, p. 56.
- 20 Chief to BOR, 9 July 1794, v D. R. (3700 : 326 -
333).
- 21 Chief to BOR, 9 July 1794, v.D.R. (3700 : 328)
- 22 Edward Cotsford's Letter, 20 December 1784,
R. C. (16 C : 1475) Kalinga Purvottaram,
Mackenzie Manuscript (State Archives, Hydera-
bad), R. 1092, Vol. 17, p. 44.
- 23 Kalinga Purvottaram, Mackenzie Manuscript,
p. 43.
- 24 Chief to BOR, 9 July 1794, v.D.R. (3700 : 329).
- 25 Chief to BOR, 9 July 1794, v.D.R. (3700 : 329-30).
- 26 Apahram Beg of Mackenzie Records, Op.Cit.?
pp. 55-57.
- 27 R.F.S.G. : C.C., 13 February 1765, p. 44.

- 28 Edward Cotsford's Letter, 20 December 1784, R. C., (16C : 1476).
- 29 D.F. Carmichael, A Manual of the District of Vizagapatam, p. 192.
- 30 Edward Cotsford's Letter, 20 December 1784, R. C. (16C : 1478).
- 31 See Appendix III.
- 32 Edward Costford's Letter, 20 December 1784, R. C. (16C : 1479).
- 33 Edward Cotsford's Letter, 20 December 1784, R. C. (16C : 1483).
- 34 Edward Cotsford's Letter, 20 December 1784, R. C. (16C : 1484).
- 35 5 June 1777, R. C. (4A : 252).
- 36 Edward Cotsford's Letter, 20 December 1784, R. C. (16C : 1485).
- 37 Manual of the Administration, f. n. p. 54.
- 38 Sitarama Raju to the Chief, 31 May 1779, v.D.R. (3683 : 53).
- 39 18 August 1778, R C., (6A : 645).
- 40 9 July 1794, v.D.R. (3700 : 332).
- 41 18 May 1777, R.C., (4A : 173-74).
- 42 5 June 1777, R.C. (4A : 252 and 254).
- 43 30 June 1777, R.C. (4B : 264).
- 44 The first Committee of Circuit was appointed on 11 October 1776 and its report was dated 15

August 1777 and it was discontinued by Thomas Rumbold.

- 45 23 August 1777, R. C., (4B : 487-90).
- 46 James Mill, The History of British India; Book v, Editor's foot-note, P. 103.
- 47 9 July 1794: v. D. R. (3700 : 332).
- 48 30 October 1777, R. C., (4C : 662).
- 49 30 October, 1777, R. C., (4C : 668).
- 50 Vijayarama Raju to the Chief, 24 December 1777, R. C., 1778, (5A ; 57-58).
- 51 James Mill, Op. cit., p. 103.
- 53 James Mill, Op. cit., p. 104.
- 53 Second Report, Committee of Secrecy, 1781; Appendix No. 153. quoted in Lanka Sundaram, Revenue Administration of the Northern Sarkars, J. A. H. R. S., Vol. XV, p. 9.
- 54 1 December 1779, v. D. R. (3683 : 165).
- 55 Chief to BOR, 9 July 1794, v. D. R. (3700 : 332).
- 56 28 September 1781, R. C., (11A : 277).
- 57 28 September 1781, R. C., (11A : 278).
- 58 21 July and 30 August 1783, v. D. R. (3686 : 323) and 384) and 11 July 1783, R. C., (13B : 600-01).
- 59 Chief to Government, 30 August 1783, v. D. R. (3686 : 384).

- 73 Chief to Vijayarama Raju, 7 July 1793, v.D.R. (3696 : 292-295).
- 74 BOR to the Chief, 2 August 1793, v.D.R. (3696 : 330-334).
- 75 7 August 1793, v.D.R. (3696 : 353).
- 76 Chief's Minute, 3 September 1793, v.D.R. (3696 : 479).
- 77 Chief to BOR, 16 February 1794, v.D.R. (3699-122).
- 78 18 and 24 January 1794, v.D.R. (3699 : 55 and 67).
- 79 BOR to the Chief, 10 March 1794, v.D.R. (3699 : 166-171).
- 80 Chief, Snow and Gregory to BOR, 22 and 23 March 1794, v.D.R., (3699 : 244, 239 and 252).
- 81 Vijayarama Raju to the Chief, 7 April 1794, v.D.R. (3699 : 339-40).
- 82 Vijayarama to the Chief, 7 April 1794, v.D.R. (3699 : 341-42).
- 83 BOR to the Chief, 8 April 1794, v.D.R. (3699 : 380-86).
- 84 BOR to the Chief, 24 April 1794, v D R. (3700 : 26-28).
- 85 25 July 1794 v.D R., (3701 : 71-72).
- 86 Chief to BOR, 3 May 1794, v.D.R. (3700 : 71-78).
- 87 Chief to BOR, 8 May 1794, v. D. R. (3700 : 103 - 104).

- 88 Vijayarama Raju to the Chief, 13 May 1794, v. D. R., (3700 - 168).
- 89 Chief to BOR, 13 and 14 May 1794, v. D. R. (3700 : 142 and 150 - 151).
- 90 A very large body of men including besides others the Rachwars receiving pay and enjoying peculiar privileges and whose services were only required in the event of invasion were called the "Desustuloo". 8 February and 6 March 1794 v. D. R., (3699 : 93 and 158).
- 91 Chief to BOR. 14 May 1794, v. D. R. (3700 : 151-52).
- 92 Capt. Cox to the Chief, 16 May 1794, v. D. R., (3700 : 164) and Minute of the Chief, 2 June 1794, v.D.R., (3700 : 263).
- 93 16 May 1794, v.D.R. (3700 : 166).
- 94 Chief to BOR, 2 June 1794 v.D.R. (3700 : 271-72).
- 95 BOR to the Chief, 25 July 1794, v.D.R. (3701-73).
- 96 3 June 1794, v.D.R. (3700 : 285-288).
- 97 Chief to Vijayarama Raju, 3 June 1794, v. D. R. (3700 : 288-89).
- 98 25 August 1794, General Reports of BOR, para 66.
- 99 Chief to Vijayarama Raju, 5 July 1794, v. D. R. (3700 : 321).
- 100 Government to the Chief, 29 June 1794, v. D. R (3700 : 320).

- 101 Chief to Vijayarama Raju, 5 July 1794, v. D. R. (3700 : 321).
- 102 Intelligence from Padmanabham, 9 July 1794, v. D. R., (3700 : 349).
- 103 Chief's instructions to Prendergast Commanding the troops in the Vizagapatam district, 5 July 1794, v. D. R. (3700 : 321).
- 104 Prendergast to the Chief, 10 July 1794, v. D. R., (3700 : 354).
- 105 Ananda Gajapati III, Vizianagaram Treaty, p. 18.
- 106 Representation from Narayana Raju to the President and Members of BOR dated 14 November 1809; 17 November 1809, v. D. R., (3746 : 271).
- 107 Ibid. 17 November 1809, v. D. R. (3746 : 271).
- 108 11 July 1807, v. D. R. (3744 : 102-3).
- 109 Collector to BOR, 12 April 1814, v. D. R. (3752:87).
- 110 17 November 1809, v. D. R. , (3746 : 272).
- 111 Collector to BOR, 14 June 1811, v. D. R. (3748:261).
- 112 Collector to BOR, 12 April 1814, v. D. R. (3752:87).
- 113 See Appendix No. IV.
- 114 Collector to BOR, 12 April 1814, v. D. R. (3752:87).
- 115 Collector to BOR, 12 April 1814, v. D. R. (3752:95).
- 116 12 April 1814, v. D. R. (3752 : 88) and 11 July 1811, v. D. R. (3727 : 323-30).

- 117 BOR to the Collector, 11 July 1811, v. D. R.
(3727 : 323-30) and 17 August 1811, v. D. R.
(3727 : 351-57).
- 118 Collector to BOR, 12 October 1811, v. D. R.
(3748 : 436-39).
- 119 Collector to BOR, 12 October 1811. v. D. R.
(3448 : 436).
- 120 Government to the Collector, 27 January 1812,
v.D R., (3729 : 57).
- 121 Collector to BOR, 29 September 1812, v. D. R.
(3749 : 236).
122. Ibid.,
- 123 Collector to BOR, 29 September 1812, v. D. R.
(3749 : 237).
- 124 Government to the Collector, 26 July 1813, v.D R.
(3730A : 166).
- 125 Narayana Raju to the Collector, 17 June 1816,
Vizianagaram Estate Management Records
(1814-18), v.D.R. (3771 : 18).
- 126 Collector to B O R, 12 April 1814, v. D. R.
(3752 : 97-98).
- 127 Collector to B O R, 12 April 1814, v. D. R.
(3752 : 98-99).
- 128 Collector to BOR, 25 March 1822, v. D. R.
(4735 : 117).
- 129 Collector to BOR, 15 August 1821, v. D. R.
(4734 : 176).

- 130 Government to the Collector, 6 October 1821,
V.D.R. (4734 : 189).
- 131 20 April 1822 V.D.R. (4535 : 211-12).
- 132 6 October 1821, V.D.R. (4734 : 196).
- 133 14 April 1824, V. D. R. (4737 : 58-65) and 29
January 1825, V.D.R. (4738 : 30).
- 134 Collector to BOR, 15 August 1827, V. D. R.
(4740 : 106) and 21 October 1827, V. D. R.
(4740 : 287).
- 135 28 March 1811, V.D.R. (3727 : 127).

CHAPTER V

The Parlakimidi and Tekkali Zamindaris (1769 – 1803)

PARLAKIMIDI (Kimidi) :

The word Parlakimidi is said “to be a corruption of the word ‘Pravala Khimundo’, ‘the coral-headed and coral-eyed’, which was the name of the last of the aboriginal rulers of this tract. He was subdued by Callahumber, a son of Kapilendra Deo, of the Royal family of Orissa. This prince is said to have quitted Cuttack along with his brother’s family in consequence of family dissensions and to have taken up his residence at Bissum Cuttack then the chief town of Jeypore”¹.

The Zamindars of Parlakimidi claimed their descent from the Gajapatis of Orissa. When the British acquired the Circars from the Nizam in 1766 Narayana Deo was the Raja. In the treaty between the Nizam and the British concluded in 1768 he was prominently mentioned. “Narraindoo, one of the Zamindars of the Circar of Chicacole, has lately raised disturbances in the Itchapore country, and refused to pay his rents or obedience to the Company; the Nabob Ausuph Jah agrees...to write letters not only to Narraindoo, but to all the Zamindars in the Circars acquainting them, that they are in future to regard the English Company as their sovereign and to pay their rents and obedience to the said Company without raising any troubles or disturbances”².

Narayana Deo was engaged in carrying on anti-British activities even before 1756. Col. Forde reported in 1759 that he was cutting off supplies to the British forces camped in Ganjam. Even after the English acquired the Circars from the Nizam, he continued to oppose the Company's authority. In 1768 the Company determined to 'reduce' him and ordered Col. Peach who was then in command of a Bengal battalion at Masulipatam to proceed against him. In May 1768 Col. Peach defeated him at Jalmoor and compelled Narayana Deo to flee to the adjacent Maliah country. To avoid complications and further disturbances, his son Gajapati Deo was proclaimed Raja but real peace was not restored.

In January 1769 Narayana Deo resumed depredations occupying Kimidi. They affected the Company's revenues and commerce. He was also intriguing with the Marathas in Cuttack against the English. But there were dissensions in the Maratha camp. So the Madras authorities decided on stern measures. They ordered the Bengal detachment and a Madras detachment to march into the Circar. With this the Company could subjugate Narayana Deo and other disturbers.

The Madras Government also determined to weaken him by weaning away his adherents³. Thus Goman Isi and Rayagudi Isi, the hill chiefs captured by Rama Jogi, were reconciled to the Government and they settled with it for their jama⁴. Linga Bhupati, Raja of Madugula, was crushed by the combined forces of Sita Rama Raju and the Company⁵. Thus Narayana Deo was weakened,

Towards the end of 1770 Narayana Deo died. His widow and minor son Gajapati Deo appealed to Sitarama Raju to help re-instatement. The settlement of 1771 fixed the tribute at Rs. 66,000 with Sitarama Raju as security. Thus it was only in 1771 that Parlakimidi acknowledged the English. Rama Jogi died in 1772 and Arzee Beg, a courtier, came into prominence.

Even after this agreement, Kimidi was in confusion. Sitarama Raju's management and intention of annexation dissatisfied the family of Narayana Deo. There was a popular rising particularly of the hill people who plundered and threatened Kimidi⁶.

The Madras Government took vigorous measures. The restoration of the country to Gajapati Deo did not normalize it. He fell into arrears and defied the Company. In January 1774 when ensign Watton and his party proceeded to collect revenues, they were killed. The Vizagapatam Council immediately sequestered the country declaring him an outlaw⁷. He fled and his brother Jagannadha Deo succeeded him in February 1775 and he offered to pay Rs. 80,000⁸. The management was entrusted to Arzee Beg as the Diwan.

The domineering Arzee Beg grossly mismanaged the country. The Zamindari fell into arrears. In 1778 when Rumbold ordered the Zamindars to Madras to settle their affairs, Arzee Beg proceeded as deputy of his master. At the time of settling the revenues of the Circar, Rumbold's Government settled the jama of the Zamindari at Rs. 86,000 an increase of 6,000 on quinquennial basis⁹. During Beg's absence Jagannadha Deo squandered his

revenue and defaulted regarding the arrears which on 31 December 1778 amounted to Rs. 1,41,867¹⁰. The Vizagapatam Council even thought of 'mortgaging or confiscating his estates'¹¹. In addition, he began to 'interfere' in the affairs of Zamindari¹². "Differences, jealousies and reciprocal fears" cropped up between Jagannadha Deo and Arzee Beg who returned from Madras and the Zamindari was in doldrums. So the Vizagapatam Council came to "the resolution of taking vigorous measures for the recovery of the Company's debt and accordingly agreed that the Detachment of one Company of Sepoys and an European officer ordered...to be in readiness at Chicacole be immediately detached to Kimmedy..."¹³.

At this juncture, the sepoys at Vizagapatam, who were ordered to embark for Madras to meet the invasion of the Carnatic by Hyder Ali of Mysore, mutinied on 3 October 1780¹⁴. Gajapati Deo, the 'dismissed' Zamindar of Kimidi under surveillance at Vizagapatam, dissuaded the 'commander' of the mutineers, Shake Mahomed and thus rescued the Company's servants¹⁵. Impressed by this, the Chief of Vizagapatam recommended his reinstatement. In November 1780¹⁶ at the direction of the Madras Government, Crawford and Maxtone, members of the Vizagapatam Council proceeded to Kimidi and restored him. The Chief and Council reconciled the two brothers and Arzee Beg continued as Diwan.

But this restoration was fruitless. Gajapati Deo, who expressed 'gratitude' to the Company and promised to "rest satisfied to live upon the Rs. 600 per month allowance and will pay into the Treasury the produce of my country until the previous arrears

are cleared off"¹⁷ could not do so. In the beginning the Company was indulgent. As he still defaulted the Vizagapatam Council decided in December 1781 "to send a military force"¹⁸ to collect the tribute. They gave him further time. But in July 1782, when the arrears amounted to Rs. 1,97,451¹⁹, they resolved to order him to Vizagapatam to explain his 'conduct' and 'assign to the Company a proportionable part of the Zamindari'²⁰. After protracted deliberations with the Council severally and collectively, on 26 July 1782 Gajapati Deo "delivered a written instrument making over the rent of the Zamindari to his brother Jagannadha Deo for two years"²¹.

Jagannadha Deo, the 'renter' of Kimidi, belied the hopes of the Chief and Council and "amused them with excuses and promises". So they decided to "send a Gentleman in the Civil Service.....to take such means as may appear necessary"²². Accordingly in March 1783 Jasper Charlton proceeded to Kimidi. The death²³ of Arzee Beg, a security for Jagannadha Deo, on 19 March 1783, complicated the matters. The rival factions of the two brothers blocked him. Jagannadha Deo and his faction exacted money from the villages. He also retired to Turlah with all his effects. The Company objected as the "renter ought not to leave the district". At this he returned and "promised to abide in future by the advice given to him"²⁴. Yet, he was not serviceable to Gordon, who succeeded Charlton in January 1784. Thus during these two years the Company collected their revenues through their representatives. In June 1784, after the expiration of two year rent period and four months before the Circuit Committee's report, the Zamindari was restored to Gajapati Deo and Gordon was recalled.

Gajapati Deo, after his reinstatement in June 1784, was submissive. He was dutiful and punctual in payments. Jagannadha Deo resided at Vizagapatam on an allowance of Rs. 500 per month. Throughout this period the jama remained at Rs. 86,000 on the basis of the observations made by the Chief and Council²⁵.

From June 1784 to 1789 Gajapati Deo paid the kists 'regularly' and cleared the arrears as stipulated by the Kaul²⁶. But, during 1790 and 1791 he defaulted as famine conditions prevailed in Vizagapatam district. On 31 April 1792 his arrears amounted to Rs. 43,000²⁷ and the old balances stood at Rs. 24,675.8.0²⁸. In May 1792 the Chief and Council summoned him to Vizagapatam and upon his arrival "discharged the greatest part of what was due"²⁹. The arrears to the Company and his brother Jagannadha Deo were still Rs. 5,622 and Rs. 9,000 respectively³⁰. In July 1792 the Madras Government increased³¹ the allowance of Jagannadha Deo to Rs. 1,000 on his representation³² that he experienced distress due to the hostile attitude of his brother towards him and the irregularity on the part of his brother in paying the "slender allowance", and on the recommendation³³ of the Chief and Council. Even though he "totally liquidated" the old balances by May 1793³⁴, his arrears began to increase "very much...on account of the monthly payments to his brother and being also indebted Rs. 17,787 to the Company forming the whole of a kist due 31 July with part of one due 31 May...³⁵" So the Chief wrote to him a "peremptory requiring him to discharge the demands due in failure of which he has been informed that he must instantly come to the Chiefship³⁶". Gajapati Deo complained

against the increase of his brother's allowance. But being conscientious, by 15 January 1794 he paid Rs. 51,000 of the total of Rs. 67,000³⁷. So the Chief and Council did not compel him to proceed to Vizagapatam.

Even though from 1784 to 1793 Gajapati Deo was "very attentive to the business of his country and managed a considerable part under his own immediate directions"³⁸, from 1794 he began to neglect his duties and by April 1794 he was "indebted for two kists and for advances on account of his brother's allowance making in all about half a lakh of Ruppees"³⁹. When the Chief began to press him, he wrote a letter⁴⁰ on 27 May to the Chief and Council claiming compensation of Rs. 32,277 for the loss of customs from September 1790 to September 1793. The Board of Revenue, in their letter dated 24 July 1794, directed⁴¹ Brown, assistant to Snow, the Collector of the Southern division, to investigate it and informed the Zamindar that on Brown's report he would be granted due indulgence. But, they emphasized that "in the meantime there must be no dealy in the payment of the Company's kists"⁴². Between May and August the Chief wrote repeatedly to him "who constantly has given assurances that he will make speedy payments". As the third kist was due on 30 September besides the arrear of half a lakh of rupees, the Chief "judged it expedient to summon him to Vizagapatam that arrangements may be made for the purpose of obtaining payment of what is due"⁴⁵, Gajapati Deo sent his 'vackeel', Varanasi Jaggappa, to Vizagapatam to represent that it would be inconvenient "if at this period, he were compelled to absent himself from his district", and assured the

Chief that much of the balance would be discharged⁴⁴. In September the Chief finding that nothing was done ordered the 'vackeel' to return to impress him with the necessity of satisfying the Company's claims immediately. He also sent him a 'formal written summons' to proceed to Vizagapatam⁴⁵. But the Council "considering the present state of matters in the District which certainly have an alarming appearance", desired the Chief 'to waive for the present the insisting upon Gajapati Narayana Deo's coming here', as they felt that "it will be for the Company's interest to temporize with Gajapati Narayana Deo, but at the same time, not to relax in his endeavours to obtain from him as considerable payments as may be practicable"⁴⁶. On 20 September Varanasi Jaggappa delivered an engagement promising payments and assured him of implementation⁴⁷. In this representation he proposed to discharge Rs. 1,00,535 on account of the Company's payments and Jagannadha Deo's allowance upto 22 February 1795 during the period between 22 September 1794 and 22 February 1795 in six instalments, viz, Rs. 3,500 on 22 September, 10,000 on 7 October, 10,000 on 22 November, 10,000 on 7 December, 31,000 on January 1st 1795 and 36,085 on 22 February 1795. He also represented that his master "exerted his utmost and secured for that purpose means which may be known to any person whom" the Chief and Council might think proper to appoint to examine into it. So it was decided to instruct Brown "when he shall proceed to Kimmedy... to enquire into the means, which the Vackeel alledges are in his master's power for the performance of his engagements.."⁴⁸. On 22 September the 'Vackeel' paid Rs. 3,500. The Chief in his letter dated 22 September informed the

Zamindar "I have counted to wait until I see whether what is promised to be paid in the next month fulfilled, and I have directed him (the Vackeel) to return to you, that you may confirm what he has engaged in your name. As to your claim on account of the suspension of customs, it will very shortly be enquired into, and what may appear proper will be remitted". Finally he reminded him "your situation is very critical therefore take great care not to displease the Company"⁴⁹.

Gajapati Deo was unable to be punctual as stipulated in the engagement of 20 September 1794. The Chief and Council being pre-occupied with Vizianagaram and considering the 'alarming' situation in the district did not favour sequestration. They felt it to be a measure "very unreasonable and likely to be followed with pernicious effects...for should Gajapati Narayana Deo, either openly or secretly favour the revolted Poligars the difficulties now to be encountered would from such circumstance receive a very considerable increase"⁵⁰. So they followed a policy of lenience. Thus, though Kimidi was not sequestered in 1794 the events foreshadowed the later developments.

From 1795 to 1803 the Company's officers at Kimidi found it very difficult to control the Zamindar, Gazapati Deo. They faced more troubles because of the contumacy of the Deo family than the Pusapati family. Gajapati Deo who upto the middle of 1794 was appreciated by the Chief and Council at Vizagapatam, neglected his duties and was irregular in payments especially on his brother's allowance⁵¹ which by June 1796 amounted to Rs. 45,100⁵². Michael Keating, the Collector, required⁵³ Gajapati

Deo to fulfil his enaagements at least to some extent by selling the paddy and "is desirous of selling for the purpose of liquidating his debt to the Company⁵⁴, in vain. In March 1797 the Board, considering "the large arrears" due from him, directed the Collector "that, should he persist in withholding the current revenue and fixing early periods for the payment of the arrear of pension to his brother, to place the whole grain under zuft, and summon the Zamindar to Chicacole for the purpose of bringing him to a settlement and if he does not make a satisfactory arrangement for the payment of the whole within the current year "to sequester the Zamindari and place his person under confinement"⁵⁵.

Before receiving these instructions, Keating proceeded into the Zamindari in the hope of "recovering the Zamindar" and could "secure the current revenue" due on 31 March 1797, through bills and grain⁵⁶. Meanwhile, he was charged with embezzlement of Rs. 1,19,380⁵⁷ and resigned in July 1797 and so the agreement was ineffective⁵⁸. So the Board of Revenue instructed Andrew Scott, his successor, to make an early and complete arrangement⁴⁹. In October an agreement was made with him subject to the approval. According to this the Zamindar agreed to pay Rs. 1,10,000 per annum until the whole of the balance then standing against him "in the Company's books", i. e., Rs. 86,000 per annum, current jama, and Rs. 34,000 per annum on account of the old balance and Rs. 7,200 to his brother, Jagann-dha Deo. Even though dissatisfied with the 'improper conduct' of the Zamindar in withholding arrears, which "the resources of his country, and the state of his circumstances might enable him at once

to pay off and in persisting to retain an armed force", against the orders of the Government and his own remonstrances, the Collector, to preserve "the peace of the country", which he thought would be much endangered by coercion "in the present weak state of the military force in the district", recommended it⁶⁰. In November the Board of Revenue, while authorizing him to conclude the agreement "though not without much reluctance", instructed him to inform the Zamindar that "the indispensable condition of this forbearance should be the Zamindar's previous dismissal of his armed peons, and his appearance... at the Collector's cutcherry with a suitable number of attendants"⁶¹. In December 1793 the Zamindar "having observed that conduct which was made the condition of forbearance towards him, and having made good the kists of the current year according to the arrangement authorized" was permitted to return⁶².

Despite the 'very serious warning' against a breach of the engagements, Gajapati Deo persisted "in being the instrument of his own ruin". Added to the failure in fulfilling the financial concessions, he showed 'a most glaring disrespect' to the Collector in 'omitting' to reply to two of his letters demanding urgent payment of the kists, and to the third letter he generally represented his incapacity intimating that he "procured the Company's money in the country which should be sent down" without regretting for his silence. So Scott summoned him and requested the Board of Revenue in his letter dated 17 February 1798 to permit him "to call upon the commanding officer of the District to take measures for enforcing his attendance"⁶³. The Government

in their letter dated 1 March observing that "the lenity, which had been hitherto shown him, instead of reclaiming him to a sense of his duty appeared to have confirmed his opposition to the Company's authority" and that "under such circumstances any further delay was unnecessary" allowed him to do so⁶⁴. Accordingly, a force was assembled under Lieutenant Colonel Muat. The Board of Revenue also directed the Collector "to admit of no compromise with this refractory Zamindar but to insist upon his obeying the summons for his appearance at Chicacole with his ordinary number of attendants", and as "he had compelled Government to assemble a large force at considerable expense and "inconvenience", to make "an adjustment of his Balance more proportionate to the means which he possessed to discharge them". Gajapati Deo was disobedient during the whole of March and Scott adopted "such measures as might assist" the operations in warning the inhabitants not to resist the Government or join the Zamindar, and in obtaining information regarding the state of the forts or posts of strength⁶⁵. Towards the end of March the Zamindar arrived at Chicacole under faith of the promise of the Collector of 24 March which was that "if he repaired thither and engaged to comply with whatever Government might require he (the Collector) would in that case request of Colonel Muat not to proceed until the determination of Government was known"⁶⁶. On hearing this, the Government desired him to "lose no time in completing a final arrangement with the Zamindar for the payment of his arrears, for the discharge of his current kists and for a reimbursement of the expenses incurred by the detachment under... Muat", to take steps for reducing the Zamindar's

force and destroy "whatever strongholds there might be in the Zamindari or clearing roads through such parts of the country as would make the march of Troops more easy"⁶⁷. Scott's negotiations for the clearance of some of the arrears failed as Gajapati Deo neither replied to his letter nor obeyed the order to be present at Chicacole along with his renters and accounts⁶⁸. So in May 1797 the Zamindar, his son Purushottama Narrain Deo and relation Dooga Raju were confined at Chicacole, Then Scott tried to rent out the Zamindari to petty renters in vain. Then it was decided to keep it under "Aumancee management" as before "if more favourable offers could not be attained from the inhabitants"⁶⁹. Gajapati Deo was urged to pay the balance⁷⁰. In November he represented to Scott that if he were reinstated he would pay Rs. 50,000 immediately for his Zamindari and get renters who would be answerable for Rs. 1,20,000 per annum, including the current jama, until the arrears were discharged⁷¹. Meanwhile the confinement provoked an upsurge in Kimidi. Writing on 27 January 1799 Scott reported: "It is no longer the inroads of the hill people for the sake of plunder that are to be guarded against but considerable bodies of armed men, who burn and destroy everything where they go..." and on 2 February "the disturbances in the Kimeddy country have now risen to so great a height, that I have scarcely a hope left of any revenue being collected, or any villages or grain being saved from destruction." ⁷². By February the insurrection developed as an alarming revolt. The Collector, with a view to obtaining "a more perfect information of the country and to restore tranquillity" removed the interneers to Masulipatam⁷³. This worsened the situation. By

March the insurrection spread into the Tekkali Zamindari and the Haveli also "without any means of checking the progress of the Bandit" and the renters and inhabitants fled, excepting some of the lower class of the people "who were as busy in plundering and destroying as the insurgents themselves"⁷⁴. To prevent the total loss of the revenues, and destruction of the grain stored at Calingapatam "which had been already threatened" and to suppress the insurrection the Government sent military aid⁷⁵. In April a Proclamation was published in the "Vizagapatam District" requiring the people to obey and warning them that "a large force has been appointed to crush this daring and unwarrantable rebellion and assure them that such rebels as may be taken in arms against the...Government will be sent on board a vessel to be kept in readiness there for the purpose of transporting them to Trincomallee"⁷⁶.

Besides all this, in March, Jagannadha Deo left Chicacole without permission, entered Kimidi and "usurped the name and authority of Zamindar, seized the revenue, alienated lands to some inhabitants, remitted the revenue usually paid to the Circar by others" and gathered a large following⁷⁷. He represented to the Collector justifying himself and requested him to re-instate. He continued to ravage the Zamindari. In April the insurgents attacked the detachment which advanced to the borders of the Kimidi 'district' and Jagannadha Deo "appeared avowedly at the head of the rebellion"⁷⁸. As the Collector reported... "the Company's authority only obtains where a military force is employed.." Finding the position very critical, to soothe the bissayes

(hill chiefs), divide rebels and restore tranquillity, the Government allowed Dooga Raju and the son of Gajapati Deo in May to proceed to Chicacole under escort⁷⁹. They also increased their force at Chicacole and Colonel Vigor proceeded to Vizagapatam to command the troops "with full powers to take such measures as he might judge necessary for the suppression of Kimmedy insurrection⁸⁰". Meanwhile the Collector tried to detach the rebels from Jagannatha Deo, who "puts very little confidence in the inhabitants of the lower Kimmedy country⁸¹". Jagannatha Deo seized a Company's officer (Captain Youngston), "who happened to be travelling peaceably along the road and kept him under restraint under pretence of keeping him till the release of Gajapati Deo". He also promised to the Hill people considerable alienations from the low lands of Kimidi⁸².

But Jagannatha Deo was unsuccessful in his efforts as many mocassadars and hill chiefs deserted him since the arrival of Colonel Vigor with Purushottama Deo and Dooga Raju. Dooga Raju's popularity produced good effects. He assisted Colonel Vigor in dispersing the insurgents. He released Gajapati Deo's family. There were large defections among Jagannatha Deo's party. Dooga Raju imprisoned Letchemanarsoo Patrudu, one of the trusted followers of Jagannatha Deo and sent him to the Presidency for transportation. All rebels retired to their places in the second range of mountains⁸³. In July a proclamation was published throughout the district "offering a reward of Rs. 10,000 to any person or persons who shall seize and deliver up... Jagannatha Deo, to any of the Company's Collectors, or to any Company's officer Commanding a Garrison or detachment, so that his person may be secured; and if any of the

Zamindars, renters or other persons subjected to the Company's authority, shall after the circulation of this proclamation, either harbour or conceal Jagan-natha Deo in their respective countries or villages, or afford him any assistance, the persons who may be found to have acted in this manner will be considered part taken of his guilt, and render themselves liable to the heavy displeasure of Government⁸⁴". By 7 June tranquillity was restored in the interior⁸⁵.

From 21 December 1799, when the Collector published a proclamation⁸⁶ announcing the resolutions of the Government regarding the "future management of the Zamindari and the conduct to be observed towards the Zamindar and his family" to 4 February 1802, the date of the death of Gajapati Deo who was declared "to have forfeited his Zamindari for ever", the Zamindari was under the Company. Dooga Raju, a relation of the family and interested in its welfare, managed it. During this period the family of Dooga Raju and Purushottama Deo, who was promised that "the Zamindari would be restored to him so soon as the necessary arrangements for its future tranquillity were completed and the liquidation of the Company's balances secured" resided at Chicacole. The Government sanctioned first ten percent of revenue and from March 1800 increased it to Rs. 1,100 for the Zamindar's family, Purushottama Deo and Dooga Raju. The Company's officers worked towards "establishing the supremacy of the Company's authority in the District, to the expediency of forming settlements with the Bissoyee providing for their holding their cowles from Government to destroying the fastness and strongholds in the low country, clearing the passess and garrisoning the

Hill Forts with the Military of the Company”⁸⁷. By 1802 they could fulfil it mostly. On the death of Gajapati Deo, who was permitted in May 1800 to return to Chicacole and reside with his family on the representation of Dooga Raju based on humanitarian grounds⁸⁸, Purushottama Deo was reinstated as Zamindar in February 1802, according to the proclamation of 21 December 1799, “until the permanent jummah should be fixed⁸⁹”.

In 1803 the Permanent Settlement was concluded with Purushottama Deo. The Zamindari was ‘entirely’ restored to him at a *russud jama*. A *jama* of Rs. 70,000 was fixed for the first ten years and thereafter Rs. 80,000. The payments of the hill chiefs were separated from it, as their possessions were ‘exempted’ from dependence on Kimidi, by the proclamation of the Government published in January 1800, and their payments were to be determined later. Dooga Raju was allowed to continue as the ‘manager’⁹⁰.

Jagannatha Deo, who fled to Ganjam, joined the rising there (1800-5). When the Collector of Ganjam, Snodgrass, tried to capture him he “had withdrawn to a village in the Maharatta country”. But he was captured in 1804. Early in 1803 Kimidi was transferred to Ganjam.

TEKKALI

The only Zamindari in the Vizagapatam district that never came under the influence of Vizianagaram was Tekkali. It was “entirely reduced, serving, and necessarily, under complete subjection”⁹¹ to the Company’s government. Its ruler was Jagannadha Jagga Deo. He was a “descen-

dant of the royal family of Orissa, but more immediately branching from that of Kimedya"⁹². The revenue of Tekkali "is very unequal, the country being without rivers lying high, and depending entirely upon the rains, it amounts on an average to Rs. 63,663-4-9 from which he disburses his jammabundy Rs. 20,000"⁹³.

From 1769 to 1774 Jagga Deo with great difficulty paid the jama and by the beginnings of 1775 only a "small" arrear remained. But in 1775 there was 'uncommon drought' in the Circar"⁹⁴. Like other Zamindars, he was also irregular in his payments and his arrears by June 1779 amounted Rs. 39,076"⁹⁵. In November the Chief Davidson, on receiving intelligence from the Zamindar "of a failure of the expected rains and a bad prospect of crop this year", came to the resolution of sending a member of the Council "to examine into its real state"⁹⁶. Charles Maxtone was deputed on 29 November 1779. He 'delivered' his report on 6 January 1780. He described the distressed condition and remarked "that the representation delivered in by Jugga Deo to the Board is true in every respect and not at all an exaggeration"⁹⁷. So the Zamindar was not pressed.

On 1 July 1780, Casamajor, the Chief, attributing "the large arrears due from the Teckally Rajah upwards of three years Jumma-bundy" to the "situation of that District, the Indolence and want of management as well as the bad government, of the Rajah" proposed to order "a Tassaldar attended by two Guards of sepoys...with a letter... addressed to the Rajah to pay the amount of Collections made in his country" to him "reserving to himself such a proportion only as will decently maintain him, and

that he must consider the Resolutions now taken with regard to him, as orders that must be attended to"⁹⁸. At this, Jagga Deo, in his letter of 25 October, promised to pay Rs. 30,000 within four months, i. e., before March 1781⁹⁹. The Board convinced 'on account of the known poverty of the Tekkali country, that the Engagements of that Zamindar... are much as can be expected from him' accepted his proposals¹⁰⁰.

Jagga Deo could pay only Rs. 28,900 of Rs. 30,000¹⁰¹ and by May 1781 his total arrears amounted to Rs. 75,427. He was summoned to Vizagapatam and on 26 June 1781 an agreement was reached. This included all the arrears and was drawn out upto 1783, when his kaul was to expire. It amounted to Rs. 1,00,845. Of this he promised to pay Rs. 5,100 on 25 July 1781 and the remaining amount of Rs. 95,745 in three years, the whole amount to be cleared off by 28 February 1784. He further promised "to mortgage the crop" of his Zamindari "every year without appropriating it to any otherwise as security" to his arrears¹⁰².

Jagga Deo paid Rs. 22,000 instead of Rs. 37,100 and on 9 August 1781 the arrears were Rs. 52,276¹⁰³. So in August 1782 the Chief and Council sent "a Tasaldar to the Teckally District deeming it on a consideration of circumstances a necessary measure while the crop is upon the ground for securing the Revenues"¹⁰⁴. In November 1782 Jagga Deo submitted a 'Representation'¹⁰⁵ to the Chief of Vizagapatam which ran as follows: "This year we have had no rains and the Inhabitants are reduced to poverty by non-produce, and unless you protect me I am not able to support myself nor my Inhabitants, I do not

request you to suffer me to keep off from paying this years kists which I shall take means to borrow or otherwise and discharge it, but I request you will have patience for the balance..." He also requested the Chief to "issue out an order that I may receive the usual customs and duties in my port¹⁰⁶ from every merchant"¹⁰⁷. The Board considered it along with the report of the Tasildar which supported the Zamindar, felt that his claims were 'just and reasonable'. They ordered "that all persons without distinction shall account with the Zamindar for the customary duties"¹⁰⁸.

In June 1783 Jagga Deo proceeded to Puri Jagannadham despite the Chief's objection. At this the Vizagapatam Council wrote "in strong terms to make him sensible of his disrespect to Government"¹⁰⁹. In October they dispatched "a Tasildar to Tekkali to secure the Grain upon the Ground as the only measure to oblige the Rajah to pay the sum specified in his letters to the Chief "¹¹⁰. By November 1783 Jagga Deo "nearly discharged the current tribute" and the Vizagapatam Council recalled the 'Tasildar'¹¹¹.

Thus during this period the Company was lenient to Tekkali. Even though they pressed him for arrears, they understood the poverty of the country, and "received so much as it afforded and permitted the rest to remain as Balance"¹¹².

Even in 1784 conditions in Tekkali were not favourable. In the words of Jagga Deo, "for want of crops last year in my district, part of the farmers from the district went away. Those that are remaining are too much in a distressed condition and myself

being unable to make advances for the present years cultivation. Therefore even this years cultivation become less and suffered"¹¹³. So he lagged behind and by September 1784 he was in arrears "for the payment of the present years jumabundy and also part of the balance" of the previous year. When the Chief pressed him 'hard', he, in his letter dated 4 October 1784 proposed to pay "this year on account of the present years Jumabundy and of the Balance Rs. 24,000 within (Macarasancarry) about the middle of January at the following payments, viz., Rs. 6,000 on 28 October, another Rs. 6,000 on 13 November 1784 and Rs. 12,000 in January 1785"¹¹⁴, The Board being 'sensible' that the circumstances represented by him "in excuse for his being in arrears are well founded" and that the proposal "he makes is as much as his country can enable him to offer, with an expectation of fulfilling his promise" decided to rely on the 'Raja'¹¹⁵.

In 1784 the Committee of Circuit in its 'Report' observed that the 'jumabundy' of Tekkali may be increased from Rs. 20,000 to Rs. 30,905 by reducing the military charges¹¹⁶. As the Chief & Council did not favour an increase, the jama remained at Rs. 20,000 till 1797 when the Zamindari was converted into Haveli¹¹⁷ as the family was extinct.

By August 1785 with 'difficulty' Jagga Deo paid "current tribute"¹¹⁸ and on 26 September paid the sum of Rs. 10,000 towards the old balance¹¹⁹. But the balance due from him on account of old arrears on 18 August 1786 amounted to Rs. 42,591. The Board of Revenue in their letter to Vizagapatam dated 13 August directed the Chief and Council to acquaint them "how this balance has been accumu-

lated and what steps have been taken to obtain the balances from him"¹²⁰. The Chief and Council in their letter¹²¹ dated 2 October replied that the balance "had considerable increase" in 1779 and 1780. The Raja promised in 1781 to pay, besides his current tribute, Rs. 12,000 annually to clear arrears; but "has never since been able to fulfil that engagement". In 1782 a 'droughty season' impoverished him and his representation was recommended to the President & Council in December 1782. Since then he paid Rs. 10,000 in the old balance, The Chief and Council added "from the peculiar circumstances of his country" with no rivers, and the "Expences incident to a numerous family, tho' regulated by an economy that strongly marks his poverty, there is little hope of his being able to liquidate his old balance for a considerable length of time". The Board of Revenue on 26 October expressed their "anxiety to effect a speedy and large reduction of the heavy outstanding debts of this nature"¹²², and suggested¹²³ to "avail of any favourable seasons or circumstances that might offer".

In 1787 Jagannadha Jagga Deo died. His son Ramakrishna Jagga Deo, a boy of about 11 years, succeeded him. To manage the Zamindari during his minority, the Chief and Council appointed Venkatapati Naidu, whom the late Raja appointed diwan just 'previous to' his death. The Raja's mother, who wished to manage, was granted some villages. She became a source of trouble to the diwan.

After becoming diwan, Venkatapati Naidu let "the principal part" of the Zamindari to Cunnappilly Ramavandanlu¹²⁴, a rich and influential person,

for two years at the yearly rent of Rs. 36,000. By July 1787 Venkatapati Naidu fell in arrears for two kists. The Chief wrote to him 'repeatedly' "reminding him of his arrears" and called upon him "for an account of his management since his appointment" to judge the causes of deficiency. Meanwhile, the Council called upon P amavadanlu "to discharge the kists which are become due according to the Cowle granted to him by Venkatapati Naidu".

In December 1788 dowager Rani, who 'very soon' after the appointment of Venkatapati Naidu began to interfere, failed to get assistance from Gajapati Deo, her half brother and from Jagannadha Deo, her full brother, and conspired to murder the diwan. She with the help of her friends, "Bagawanoo and Buxy" sirdars and a deposed sirdar, 'Santosa Row', employed people 'to betray' him "while carelessly at house at night or while returning from the Rajah's house". But this failed as it was "discovered intime by the good offices¹²⁵" of Gajapati Deo, of Kimidi. In his letter dated 23 December 1788, Venkatapati Naidu after informing the incident, ¹²⁶ requested the Chief to "favour" him "with twenty sepoy's in addition to what are here". So the Chief sent a "Jemidars guard to Tekkali for the protection of the diwan". He in his reply to Venkatapati Naidu on 27 December directed him to "make the Rajah's mother a prisoner and that the produce of the villages under her, which enables her to form such horrid schemes, be kept from her direction, but that a certain proportion be allowed for her maintenance and cloaths and the surplus must be reserved for the Rajah hereafter taking care to keep Regular accounts of the receipts and disbursements for inspection when called for". Before this letter reached Venkatapati

Naidu, the 'woman', on 27 December, went to his house with the Raja, abused him "with great deal of bad words" and forcibly carried away Santosa Row, "by pushing away the sepoy's who kept him Guard". She carried the Raja and Santosa Row into the neighbouring 'Bommallie' district¹²⁷. The Chief in his letter dated 30 December disapproved his action "in suffering the woman to force away the Sirdar from the Sepoy's" and cautioned him "if you behave so timidly it is impossible for things to go Right". He also informed him that "the Board have determined that a sufficient Guard shall be immediately sent to bring the woman back to Teckally as also Santosa Row..."¹²⁸.

Thereafter, the dowager, with "a view of using her influence" to get the management went to Vizagapatam. But the Chief and Council, thinking "her residence on the spot, might impede the Diwan in the execution of his duty" resolved "not to let her return". They fixed Kasimkota as her residence under "some kind of restraint". She remained there quietly for about four months. Then at the repeated "solicitations" of her son, and her "promises of not again interfering with his management" the diwan 'interceded with the Chief & Council on her behalf' and she was set at liberty¹²⁹.

Soon after this second indulgence, she complained against him and "sent a tom tom round, giving notice she was to have the management of the country, and that no order of the diwan was to be obeyed". The Chief and Council ordered him to Vizagapatam to inquire into his conduct: When nothing appeared against him, he was ordered to resume his office, but the old woman did not give

up the management. So he did not proceed to Tekkali. In 1790 the Chief and Council renewed his Kaul for four years on the condition that he was to pay yearly Rs. 24,000. This secured to them the regular payment of their jama of Rs. 20,000 as well as Rs. 4000 of a former balance of Rs. 30,000. "The country having at this time every appearance of an approaching famine, from the small quantity of rain that had fallen", he was not anxious about his situation as Diwan, "especially as he and the Raja's mother could not agree". So, he did not complain, when he found he could not resume his authority¹³⁰.

When Venkatapati Naidu was unwilling to rent the country, offer was made to Ramavadanlu. He and his relative Venkatavadanlu rented most of the Zamindari for four years from 27 February 1790 to 27 July 1794 on the same terms as in the kaul of Venkatapati Naidu. The Chief and Council agreed to lend them "their support and protection" on the condition that "they are responsible for whatever additional jumma may be added to the Company's cowl".

Even though the country suffered from the "long and severe famine",¹³¹ for more than two years in 1790 and 1791, Ramavadanlu regularly paid the jama. In January 1792 the balance of the current jama was Rs. 6,667 and the old balance Rs. 15,690¹³². He agreed to discharge it at Rs. 4,000 per annum. But the failure of crops prevented payment of previous instalment. So it was proposed to liquidate the sum of Rs. 8,000 'in the present year' in four instalments of Rs. 2,000 each on 30 June, 31 July, 31 August and 15 September 1792. The Chief and council accepted

this "as Ramavadanlu who is security for the discharge of the Teckally balance assures us that this offer will be made good"¹³³.

In his General Report of the Vizagapatam District under date 1 June 1792¹³⁴, the Chief observed on Tekkali Zamindari thus : "The Rajah is about 16 years of age, and his affairs are principally managed by Ramavadanloo, who is security for the payments to the Company.

"The jammabundy remains at Rs. 20,000 and a cowle is to be given at that rate for the year 1792 and 1793. The old balance is reduced to Rs. 15,690".

"The Rains having been deficient during the two last years-the misery and distress have been very great throughout the district. These causes have naturally precluded of an increase of Jammabundy for the present".

On 12 June 1792 the Chief received a letter dated¹³⁵ 8 June from Snodgrass, Resident at Ganjam, enclosing a petition from the Raja of 'Turlah' representing that on 29 April at night a number of 'Tekkali' peons sent by the Tekkali dowager plundered the house of an 'eminent' banyan named Jagannayakulu in his Zamindari and requested him to "grant redress". On this, the Chief wrote a letter¹³⁶ to the Raja of Tekkali who, instead of admitting the complaints, preferred "a string of charges against the Turlah Rajah". "As the two Rajas are very enimical to one another... and as the Inhabitants of both districts are remarkable for their predatory disposition" the Chief felt that "it will ever be a most difficult matter to ascertain what he losses by plunder may be, and

whose people are the aggressors". So the Chief wrote to both enjoining them "under pain of the Company's severe displeasure not to suffer their people to interfere with or molest one another¹³⁷".

In October 1792 Snodgrass considering the fact that "the robbery however having been considerable and the ruin of an individual, who produces Evidences¹³⁸ strongly criminatory of the Teckally Raja's mother" again requested the Chief to reconsider the matter. He ordered two principal witnesses Deenabandu and Damodarudu, who gave written declarations 'before him', to proceed to Vizagapatam for 'further examination'¹³⁹ entrusting the former with a letter from him.

They did not reach Vizagapatam as the former was "seduced or terrified from the execution of his duty" and the latter was "deprived of his liberty" by the Tekkali Zamindar. So Snodgrass, "to preclude the repetition of such contumacy on the part of the Zamindar" dispatched in March 1793, the Original complaint and the "two depositions" of the witnesses with an escort¹⁴⁰. The Board considering the letter required the Raja of Tekkali "to send his mother to the Chiefship immediately, in order that an inquiry may take place relative to the Robbery said to be committed in the Turlah Zamindari by her instructions"¹⁴¹.

The Zamindar, while preferring a complaint "similar to the one exhibited by the Turlah Zamindar", acquainted the Chief "that he was himself ready to proceed to Vizagapatam but that his mother was too infirm to undertake a journey of this kind at present"¹⁴². "As the refusal of the Teckally Raja's

mother to repair to the Chiefship" appeared to the Board "an evasion of the orders of the Chief and Council and as her influence in the Country seems to impede the business of the management, and to give a cover to different abuses" they decided that "she be obliged by force if no other means can prove efficacious to repair thither". They also decided to summon the Raja and his diwan "to attend at the same time"¹⁴³.

To these 'commands', the Raja in 'his letter dated 22 August 1793 expressed his inability to travel as he was in distress for his 'daily subsistence and even for want of expenses' since the "three years famine". So in October the mother, son and diwan were escorted to Vizagapatam.

According to the orders of the Board of Revenue dated 9 January 1794¹⁴⁴, the Chief and Council in their letter of 24 January¹⁴⁵ directed Atkinson, assistant to Arthur William Gregory, Collector in the Northern Division, to investigate the "different subjects" of Tekkali with the assistance of the diwan. He started his work in February¹⁴⁶ and submitted his report on 28 March¹⁴⁷.

Regarding robbery, his report "clearly established, that the House of the Turlah Banian was plundered" but did not prove that "the plunderers were all Teckally people, and that they were sent on this service by the Raja of Teckally's mother". So Rs. 2,500 was fixed¹⁴⁸ as "ample compensation" for the 'Turlah Banian' to be discharged by the Chief and Council from the first surplus revenue of the Zamindari after providing for the monthly allowance to the Zamindar and the charge incurred in bringing the dowager to Vizagapatam"¹⁴⁹.

Regarding dowager's interference, Atkinson, stating that "her interference has been to the utmost extent, having taken the entire management into her own hands, in contempt of the Company's authority, the Chief and Council having appointed Venkatapati Naidu, Diwan to the Zamindari during the minority of her son" and "as her interference in the management of the country has been a cause of reducing it to its present low state" submitted "for consideration, the propriety of immediately putting the country under the management of a careful person, or letting it out for three or five years, at the expiration of which time, the young Rajah will be of a sufficient age, to take upon himself the management". Considering this and the fact that "the Diwan Venkatapati Naidoo is from his advanced time of life and other causes unequal to such a charge", the Chief and Council recommended ¹⁵⁰ that "Ramavadanloo, who is on every account the most fit person, be invested with the entire management of the Zamindari, during the Raja's minority which will cease in three years". Their choice fell on Ramavadanlu, because "it had been established that he supported the Zamindari during periods when very little could be had from it¹⁵¹, because it was known that he had paid the jama regularly "and occasionally some proportions of the old arrears"¹⁵² "notwithstanding the heavy losses he must have sustained during the three years of famine". He was esteemed by the natives "to whom he always did the most ample justice".

In their letter of 8 July, the Board of Revenue disapproved this on the ground that "he was concerned in loans with individuals and engaged in

various other transactions of a private and mercantile nature” and that a man with “considerable Rents in the Havelly and in different parts of the Vizianagaram Zamindari, besides extensive private concerns according to his own declaration, was a very improper selection for discharging the duties of Manager of the Zamindari of a minor”¹⁵³. They preferred some other person of “character and responsibility”. On this the Chief and Council selected Ramanapati Naidu, Venkatapati Naidu’s brother and “instructed him with the management” until the Board of Revenue’s approval¹⁵⁴. In their letter dated 7 October, the Board of Revenue confirmed this¹⁵⁵. They fixed the allowance of the minor and his family at Rs. 5,000 per annum in equal monthly instalments. On 20 October the Vizagapatam Board informed him of this decision¹⁵⁶. Accordingly he was asked “to take all possible means to extend the cultivation, to attend carefully to the regular discharge of the Company’s jumma” of Rs. 20,000 and Rs. 4,000 “in part of the old balance every year”, not to misappropriate to the ‘use’ of the Zamindari and leave the ‘surplus revenue’ untouched pending the directions of the Board of Revenue. He was also directed to list out debts and “to take care that no part of the revenue of the Zamindari be appropriated to the discharge of such debts without express orders for the purpose”. The diwan requested¹⁵⁷ the Chief and Council to allow the Raja and his mother to return to Tekkali, feeling that “they cannot live at Vizagapatam upon the allowance proposed for them” and that “if they were detained here, the ignorant people in the Zamindari will suppose that he is the cause of it, which will much impede him in the management of

the public business, and may eventually endanger his life in that country..." The Board of Revenue¹⁵⁸ while refusing permission to the 'Mother' to return did not object to the return of the 19 year old Raja.

From 1794 the Zamindar Ramakrishna Jagga Deo of Tekkali being a minor, Ramanapati Naidu managed it for the Company. In August 1796, being of age he solicited the Government to install him¹⁵⁹. In January 1797 the Government decided to allow him to succeed and granted him kaul providing for the administration and 'joint security' of Ramanapati Naidu. To prevent the possible effects of Ramavadanlu's counsel who used to advance large amounts to the young Zamindar and influence him, the Zamindar was 'interdicted from residing' at Chicacole. He was asked to pay Rs. 20,000 towards 'current jumma' for Fasli 1206 and Rs. 10,000 per annum in liquidation of old balance¹⁶⁰. The dowager who was ordered to reside at Vizagapatam, because of her intrigues in 1794, on the 'prayers' of her son and manager representing the 'declining state' of her health and after their execution of bonds for her good conduct, was permitted to return¹⁶¹.

During the year 1797, because of the misunderstanding between the Zamindar and his manager, confusion prevailed. Of the Rs. 30,000 only Rs 13,105 was paid. As Ramanapati Naidu "was held strictly responsible" according to his engagements for the payment of 'full revenue', the Government threatened him with confinement and attachment of his property "wherever to be found"¹⁶². The young Zamindar, who disliked his supremacy, offered" for paying off the balance due on account

of last year, provided he were to be put in complete possession of the district". Considering it "preferable to continuing the security of Ramanapati Naidu, whose conduct in not immediately rendering amounts of his management appeared reprehensible" the Government expressed its willingness to deliver the country "if the renters of any number of villages equal to the amount of the Company's current jamma and old balances (Rs. 30,000) would bind themselves with the Zamindar's concurrence to pay their kists direct into the Collector's treasury (holding him also responsible)". Further the Government considering the fact that "if the balance due was to be made good from the current resources of the country, would only entail distress on the Zamindar and be productive of certain future loss of revenue to the Company" decided to realize the balance of last year from Ramanapati Naidu "who was clearly answerable and it appeared had made sufficient collections to pay"¹⁶³. In September 1797 the Zamindar produced the securities and the Board of Revenue transmitted "for the guidance of the Collector in the Cabooliat to be taken from Ramakrishna Jagga Deo draft of the Cowle which... should be granted to him for this and the following year"¹⁶⁴.

The Government after receiving his Cabooliat in October 1797 transmitted a kaul 'duly executed' to the Collector in November 1797. Meanwhile, the young Zamindar unfortunately died. As the securities had the charge of the whole country and punctually paid, they were continued in their respective farms¹⁶⁵.

On the death of the Zamindar, Harekrishna Jagga Deo, a relative preferred a claim, but "it

having been established that he is an illegitimate son of the father of the last incumbent, his pretensions were deemed inadmissible, and as no other legal claimant has appeared", the Zamindari was escheated¹⁶⁶.

In August 1799 the Collector proposed allowances for the dowager and also for Harekrishna Jagga Deo 'natural' brother of Ramakrishna Jagga Deo and the Government in September sanctioned Rs. 150 monthly to each. But before these orders reached Chicacole, Harekrishna died leaving only the dowager¹⁶⁷.

Early in 1803 the Tekkali haveli was transferred to Ganjam.

* * *

REFERENCES

- 1 T. J. Maltby, The Ganjam District Manual, p. 25 See also 'Oram's Report on Kimmedy' in Report of the Committee of Circuit, p. 92.
- 2 C. W. Aitchison, A Collection of Treaties, Engagements and Sannads, Vol. V, p. 23.
- 3 Masulipatam to Madras, 13 November 1769, MC (66 : 539-40).
- 4 Vizagapatam to Madras, 20 May 1770, MC (67 : 151-52).
- 5 Vizagapatam to Madras, 20 August 1770, MC (67 : 285-86).
- 6 Cotsford to Madras, 16 March 1772, MC (71 : 209-13).
- 7 14 December 1774, RC (1 : 157).
- 8 22 February 1775, RC (2 : 22).
- 9 11 December 1778, V.D.R., (3682 : 169).
- 10 21 January 1779, RC (7A : 45-46).
- 11 21 January 1779, RC (7A : 47).
- 12 21 June 1779, RC (7B : 442).
- 13 20 March 1780, V.D.R. (3684 : 30-33).
- 14 4 October 1780, V.D.R. (3684 : 156-59).

- 15 4 October 1780, v.D.R. (3684 : 160). At that time the Chief of Vizagapatam was James Henry Casamajor.
- 16 25 November 1780, v.D.R., (3684 : 239).
- 17 Gajapati Deo to the Chief, 24 October 1780, v.D.R., (3684 : 185-87).
- 18 Chief to Gajapati Deo, 16 December 1781, v.D.R. (3685 : 183).
- 19 27 July 1782, v.D.R., (3685 : 240).
- 20 24 July 1782, v.D.R. (3685 : 226-29).
- 21 26 July 1782, v.D.R., 3685 : 234-37).
- 22 2 March 1783, v.D R. (3686 : 100).
- 23 Tasildar to the Chief, 24 March 1783, v. D. R. (3686 : 119-21).
- 24 Jagannadha Deo to the Chief, 14 July 1783, v. D. R. (3686 : 317-22).
- 25 28 May 1785, v. D. R. (3688 : 143-44); January 1789, General Reports of BOR, para 35 and 9 June 1793, v.D.R. (3696 : 225).
- 26 Chief and Council to Government, 13 September 1784, v. D. R. (3687 : 337 and 15 August 1785, v.D.R. 3688 : 223).
- 27 15 May 1792, v. D. R. (3695 : 162).
- 28 General Report of the Vizagapatam District, 1 June 1792, v.D.R. (3695 : 184).
- 29 Ibid.

- 30 Chief to B O R, 28 October 1792, v. D. R. (3695 : 312).
- 31 B O R to the Chief, 27 July 1792, v. D. R. (3695 : 222).
- 32 Representation of Jagannadha Deo, 5 March 1792, v.D.R. (3695 : 82).
- 33 Chief and Council to BOR, 13 March 1792 v.D R (3695 : 97).
- 34 15 May 1793, v. D. R. (3696 : 203).
- 35 3 September 1793, v. D. R. (3696 : 479).
- 36 Ibid.
- 37 15 January 1794, v. D. R. (3699 : 28).
- 38 11 August 1793 v. D. R. (3696 : 371)
- 39 17 August 1794, v. D. R. (3701 : 230).
- 40 2 June 1794, v. D. R. (3700 : 258).
- 41 1 August 1794, v. D. R. (3701 : 136).
- 42 3 September 1794, v.D.R. (3702 : 78).
- 43 17 August 1794, v D. R. (3701 : 230).
- 44 5 September 1794, v.D.R. (3702 : 88).
- 45 Ibid.
- 46 15 September 1794, v. D. R. (3702 : 146).
- 47 29 September 1794, v. D. R. (3702 : 284-85).
- 48 Chief and Council to BOR, 29 September 1794, v. D. R. (3702 : 284).

- 49 Chief to Gajapati Deo, 29 September 1794, v. D. R. (3702 : 285-86).
- 50 Chief and Council to BOR, 15 September 1794, v. D. R. (3702 : 146),
- 51 Jagannadha Deo to Webb, September 1795, v. D. R. (3704 C : 712 and 718-20).
- 52 Keating to Webb, 12 June 1796, v. D. R. (3706 : 59-61).
- 53 Keating to BOR, 28 February 1797; General Reports of BOR, paras 58 and 59.
- 54 29 May 1795, v. D. R. (3704B : 517).
- 55 BOR, to Keating, 10 October 1797, General Reports of BOR, para 40.
- 56 Keating to BOR, 24 April 1797, General Reports of BOR, para 41.
- 57 T. J, Maltby, Op. cit. p. 130 and 1 October 1798, General Reports of BOR, paras 126 and 128.
- 58 Scott to BOR, 1 October 1797, General Reports of BOR, para 42.
- 59 Ibid.
- 60 Scott to BOR, 25 January 1798, General Reports of BOR, para 46.
- 61 Government in Consultations, 25 January 1798, General Reports of BOR, paras 47 to 49.
- 62 Scott to BOR, 25 Janaury 1798, General Reports of BOR, Para 50.

- 63 Scott to BOR, 26 February 1798, General Reports of BOR, para 84.
- 64 Government in Consultation, 1 October 1798, General Reports of BOR, paras 85 to 87.
- 65 Scott to BOR, 1 October 1798, General Reports of BOR, para 88.
- 66 Scott to Government, 1 October 1798, General Reports of BOR, para 89.
- 67 1 October 1798, General Reports of BOR, paras 90 to 95.
- 68 1 October 1798, General Reports of BOR, paras 96 to 99.
- 69 1 October 1798, General Reports of BOR, paras 100 to 103.
- 70 1 October 1798, General Reports of BOR, paras 104 to 109.
- 71 Scott to BOR, 20 June 1799, General Reports of BOR, para 83.
- 72 Scott to Webb, 2 February 1799, v.D.R. (3714A : 42-43).
- 73 Scott to BOR, 20 June 1799, General Reports of BOR, paras 85 and 86.
- 74 20 June 1799, General Reports of BOR, paras 86 to 89.
- 75 20 June 1799, General Reports of BOR, paras 89 and 90.

- 76 Proclamation dated 6 April 1799, May 1799 v.D.R. (3714A : 101-102) and 20 June 1799, General Reports of BOR, paras 92 to 95.
- 77 Proclamation of the Government, 10 July 1799, v.D.R. (3714B : 203).
- 78 Scott to BOR, 20 June 1799, General Reports of BOR, para 100.
- 79 BOR to Scott, 20 June 1799, General Reports of BOR, para 96.
- 80 Government to BOR, 20 June 1799, General Reports of BOR, para 101.
- 81 Scott to BOR, 20 June 1799, General Reports of BOR, para 103.
- 82 BOR in Consultations, 20 June 1799, General Reports of BOR, para 105.
- 83 Scott to BOR, 20 June 1799, General Reports of BOR, para 105 and 20 January 1800, Ibid., paras 141, 142 and 147.
- 84 10 July 1799, v.D.R. (3714B : 201 : 04).
- 85 20 January 1800, General Reports of BOR, para 147.
- 86 Permanent Settlement (3rd division) 29 April 1803, v. D. R. (3768 : 48-49).
- 87 20 January 1800, General Reports of BOR, paras 148 to 166.
- 88 Scott to BOR, 5 June 1800, BORC, pp. 4841-42 and 4853.

- 89 Permanent Settlement (3rd division), v. D. R. (3768 : 49).
- 90 Ibid., (3768 : 48).
- 91 James Grant, 'Political Survey of the Northern Circars', The Fifth Report, p. 219.
- 92 Ibid.,
- 93 Report of the Committee of Circuit, 11 October 1784, p. 17.
- 94 21 January 1776, RC (3A : 12).
- 95 21 June 1779, v.D.R. (3683 : 73).
- 96 29 November 1779, v. D. R. (3683 : 158).
- 97 Maxtone's Report, 6 January 1780, v. D. R. (3684 : 12-13).
- 98 1 July 1780, v. D. R. (3684 : 71).
- 99 Jagga Deo to the Chief, 30 October 1780, v.D.R. (3684 : 204-205).
- 100 Ibid.,
- 101 12 May 1781, v. D. R. (3685 : 68)
- 102 26 June 1781, v.D.R. (3685 : 92-93).
- 103 9 August 1782, v. D. R. (3685 : 256).
- 104 30 August 1782, v. D. R. (3685 : 272).
- 105 2 December 1782, v. D. R. (3685 : 300).
- 106 Poondy, a sea port.
- 107 European and native merchants.

- 108 5 December 1782, v. D. R. (3685 : 302)
- 109 30 June 1783, v. D. R. (3686 : 304).
- 110 20 October 1783, v. D. R. (3686 : 459).
- 111 24 November 1783, v. D. R. (3686 : 501).
- 112 2 December 1782, v. D. R. (3685 : 300).
- 113 Jagga Deo to the Chief 5 October 1784, v. D. R.
(687 : 355).
- 114 Ibid.,
- 115 5 October 1784, v.D.R. (3687 : 356).
- 116 Report of the Committee of Circuit, p. 17.
- 117 28 May 1785, v.D.R. (3685 : 144).
- 118 15 August 1785, v.D.R. (3688 : 223).
- 119 26 September 1785, v.D.R. (3688 : 250).
- 120 28 August 1786, v.D.R. (3690 : 10).
- 121 9 October 1786, v.D.R. (3690 : 27-28).
- 122 13 November 1786, v.D.R. (3690 : 47).
- 123 23 November 1786, v.D.R. (3690 : 66).
- 124 Ramavadanlu was a "Brahmin of high caste and respectability... a man of integrity and great humanity", "a renter particularly attentive to the ease, comfort and Security of his ryots" and "highly respected throughout the district".
Chief to BOR, 29 September 1794, v. D. R.
(3702 : 281).
- He had concerns in the Vizianagaram Zamindari and Haveli.

- 125 27 December 1788, v.D.R. (3692 : 488).
- 126 27 December 1788, v.D.R. (3692 : 480).
- 127 30 December 1788, v.D.R. (3692 : 522-24).
- 128 30 December 1788, v. D. R. (3692 : 524-25).
- 129 3 April 1794, v.D.R. (3699 : 302).
- 130 3 April 1794, v. D. R. (3699 : 303-304)
- 131 July 1792, (General Reports of BOR, para 42.
- 132 16 February 1792, v. D. R. (3695 : 46).
- 133 20 January 1792, v.D.R. (3695 : 12).
- 134 1 June 1792, v.D.R. (3695 : 185).
- 135 12 June 1792, v.D.R. (3695 : 302-306)
- 136 18 June 1792, v. D. R. (3695 : 222)
- 137 28 July 1792, v. D. R. (3693 : 282)
- 138 The principal evidences were Deenabandu and Vencappah, sibbendy sepoy's belonging to Ganjam and Damodarudu, a private peon to the mother of the Tekkali Zamindar.
- 139 26 February 1793, v. D. R. (3696 : 67-68).
- 140 26 April 1793, v. D. R. (3696 : 168).
- 141 26 April 1793, v. D. R. (3696 : 169)
- 142 Representation of Tekkali Raja, 18 July 1793, v. D. R., (3696 : 319-20).

- 143 Resolution of BOR, 18 July 1793, v. D. R. (3696-321).
- 144 B O R to the Chief, 9 January 1794, v. D. R. (3699 : 49-50).
- 145 Chief and Council to Atkinson, 24 January 1794, v. D. R. (3699 : 64-66).
- 146 Atkinson to the Chief, 18 February and 9 March 1794, v. D. R. (3699 : 134 and 162).
- 147 Report of Atkinson, 3 April 1794, v. D. R. (3699: 134 and 162).
- 148 Chief and Council to BOR, 8 August 1794, v. D. R. (3701 : 192).
- 149 BOR to the Chief and Council, 31 August 1794, v. D. R. (3702 : 43).
- 150 Chief and Council to BOR, 4 April 1794, v. D. R. (3699 : 324-25).
- 151 He 'constantly' supplied the Zamindar with money for his necessary expenses when his affairs "have been so distressed that he has for some time been entirely dependent" on him. By July 1794 the amount thus advanced amounted to Rs. 79,341. Ramavadanlu's representation to Keating, 23 August 1794, v. D. R. (3701-290-91).
- 152 Chief to BOR, 29 September 1794, v. D. R. (3702: 281-83)
- 153 BOR to the Chief and Council, 3 September 1794, v. D. R. (3702 : 72-73)
- 154 4 and 8 August 1794, v. D. R. (3701 : 171 and 192).

- 155 BOR to the Chief and Council, 16 October 1794, v.D.R. (3703 : 61-71).
- 156 20 October 1794, v.D.R. (3703 : 94-96).
- 157 Representations of Ramanapati Naidu, 8 August 1794, v.D.R. (3701 : 196) and 26 September 1794, v.D.R. (3702 : 261).
- 158 BOR to the Chief and Council, 16 October 1794, v.D.R. (3703 : 71).
- 159 28 February 1797, General Reports of BOR, para 55.
- 160 28 February 1797, General Reports of BOR, paras 56 and 87 and 9 January 1797, BORC, pp. 137-39).
- 161 Keating to BOR, 2 and 12 January 1797, BORC pp. 33-36 and 95-98.
- 162 1 October 1797, General Reports of BOR, paras 42 and 43.
- 163 1 October 1797, General Reports of BOR, para 44.
- 164 1 October 1797, General Reports of BOR, para 45.
- 165 25 January 1798, General Reports of BOR, para 51 and 52.
- 166 25 January 1798, General Reports of BOR, para 53 and 1 October 1798, Ibid., para 115.
- 167 20 January 1800 General Reports of BOR, para 174.

Active Sub-Feudatory Zamindaris**PALAKONDA :**

Palkonda (Palakonda) lies on the north - east of the district, adjoining Ganjam and is watered by the perennial Nagavali and its tributary the Suvarnamukhi. It consists of two widely differing parts; namely, the plain, nearly one half of which is paddy-fields and the Agency, in the northern low hills with the maximum height of 3,000 feet, covering an area of 160 square miles with less cultivation¹.

Palakonda was an ancient Zamindari with an eventful history. Visvambhara Deo I, Raja of Jey-pore from 1672 to 1676², granted it to the son of one Donaita (Donoydoo)³ a Khond or Jatapu⁴, with the title of Narendra Raidoo. One of his descendants was Veera Bahu Vijayarama Narendra Raidoo⁵. After his death his grandson, Dharma Raja Narrendra Raidoo succeeded him. From his time to 1746 the family paid Rs. 12,000 yearly to the 'Nabob' of Chicacole. In 1747 when Bahrulla Khan, the 'Nabob' and Pedda Vijayarama Raju 'disputed', Palakonda acted 'in favour' of the former. Pedda Vijayarama Raju defeated Bahrulla Khan, and Palakonda became his tributary⁶. Upto 1755 Palakonda paid Rs. 18,00 as 'tribute'. In 1755 it was raised to thirty thousand and continued for twenty three years. After the acquisition of the Circars, Andrews, the Chief of Vizagapatam, prevailed upon Vizianagaram to be security for hill Zamindars whence it considered them as tributaries and when they defaulted it used to

dispossess them with the British assistance. Sitarama Raju, two or three times, attempted to annex Palakonda, in vain owing to its strength whose troops were esteemed "the best in the district being more used to service than any others .."⁷

During this period the Zamindar was Ramabhadra Raju, "an indolent man and negligent, in what regarded the policy and the revenue of his district"⁸, He entrusted the management to his diwan Yerkanna Dora who for sometime transacted its affairs.

Palakonda was divided into 'two 'districts' i. e., Palakonda and Viraghattam. Ramabhadra Raju managed the 'Palakonda Country' and paid Rs.18,000. His nephews Vijayarama Raju and Kurma Raju possessed Viraghattam and paid Rs. 12,000. Sometime before the demise of Ramabhadra Raju, the diwan proposed to him to adopt his son Neeladri Raju, which he did, and soon after his death (1778), the diwan secured the fort and proclaimed his son, of ten years as the Zamindar. The inhabitants "who are hill people rose and put the two brothers in the management of the country, levied contributions in their favour, seized the repositories of grain which the people secured for them, burned the villages in the vicinity of Palakonda where the Diwan and his son resided, drove away the cattle into remote places, by which means an entire stop was put to the cultivation"⁹. Vijayarama Raju appealed to Sitarama Raju and obtained through him¹⁰ British assistance. The Chief and Council at Vizagapatam also supported him¹¹. Yerkanna Dora delivered up the fort and a reconciliation took place between him and Vijayarama Raju. He informed the Chief and Council "that it was the desire of each that the

Government of the district of Palakonda should in future be carried on under the management of Vijayarama Raju... that he has agreed to give him his advice and assistance as his diwan...¹². He did not live long thereafter and died in 1779; and Sitarama Raju with the Company's permission placed Vijayarama Raju and Kurma Raju in Palakonda and Viraghattam respectively and raised the jama to Rs. 50,000. Kurma Raju died soon and Vijayarama Raju succeeded to the whole Zamindari.

In 1784 the Committee of Circuit estimated the gross revenue of Palakonda at Rs. 1,11,000 and proposed a reduction in his military force to save Rs. 33,744, to be added to his tribute. "This rajah" they added, "is a very weak man, and your Lordship will determine whether he is to remain under the orders of Vizianagaram or manage the country with an increased jamabandy under the Company, or whether he should retire upon a stipend and the district to be added to the havaily..."¹³. But no action was taken. Palakonda continued to pay Rs. 50, 000 annually. In 1790 Sitarama Raju prevailed on his brother to give a sanad for the revenue of a lakh of rupees. After his removal, Vijayarama Raju reduced it to Rs. 60, 000. In 1793 Sitarama Raju demanded the difference for the last two years. When Palakonda was about to create troubles,¹⁴ Sitarama Raju proceeded to Madras in June 1793 on summons and Vizianagaram was sequestered. Even though Vijayarama Raju fixed the jama at Rs. 60,000 Palakonda paid only Rs. 50,000 upto 1793¹⁵.

During this period the relations between the Vizianagaram and Palakonda families were that of a

suzerain and a tributary. Even though during Sitarama Raju's management there were some difficulties and differences, because of the liberality of Pusapati Vijayarama Raju the relations were cordial on the whole. In the words of Palakonda Vijayarama Raju himself "the Rajahs have always treated my ancestors and myself very kindly and I have nothing to complain".¹⁶

After sequestration, Vizianagaram was divided into Southern, Central and Northern divisions under Collectors. Palakonda, in the northern division came under the Collector, Gregory. Vijayarama Raju had now to pay Rs 50,000 to the Company complaining that he was 'unable to pay the high revenue' and he intended to appeal to the Government. He was 'very punctual' and he exhibited a "zeal for the Company's interest"¹⁷. In his letter to the Board of Revenue he informed them that he "shall remain with submission to the Company's orders"¹⁸.

Since the battle of Padmanabham Vijayarama Raju began to defy the Government. By 8 September 1794 it appears that despite the endeavours and admonitions of Gregory¹⁹ he joined "in the combination said to have been formed among the hill poligars". The 'infatuated' Zamindar after "much wavering and irresolution" "notwithstanding professions of fidelity"²⁰ declared for the insurgents at Makkuva²¹. But he did not actively associate himself with the insurgents and the combination itself was not very active, as its main aim was to retain Narayana Raju and utilize him to regain their Zamindaris at a low jama.

Even after the submission of Narayana Raju, Vijayarama Raju, who left Makkuva on 18 Septem-

ber,²² became 'particularly refractory' by December 1794 and despite the Collector's injunctions did not disband armed peons and remit the revenue²³. As he continued his 'flagrant proceedings' and became "a most active promoter of present disturbances"²⁴, the Government decided to employ 'coercive' measures.

As Vijayarama Raju continued his depredations from Viraghattam, about thirteen miles from Palakonda, the Government decided to seize it. After two attempts on 5 and 19 March 1795²⁵ the Government with re-inforcements captured it in April²⁶ and demolished it. He fled to the hills behind his country. The Government, finding it difficult to capture him²⁷ offered, in November 1795, a reward of one thousand pagodas for his apprehension"²⁸. Finally in April 1796, because of his inability to stay in the hills and the opposition of his first wife and her son Sitarama Raju²⁹, (the eldest) he surrendered³⁰ to the Government and was confined at Vizagapatam and deposed.

After the surrender of Vijayarama Raju, the Zamindari was for sometime under the Collector. But, as the "particular situation"³¹ rendered it inexpedient, in December 1796 it was restored to the loyal Sitarama Raju at Rs. 50,000³². He died in July 1798 and was succeeded by his brother Venkatapati Raju, of nine years. The management was entrusted to Parasurama Patrudu who was appointed Diwan³³. The Permanent Settlement confirmed the Zamindari to Venkatapati Raju at Rs. 51,000 for the first five years and Rs. 55,000 thereafter.

In June 1803, the Collector Robert Alexander, considering the long confinement of Vijayarama

Raju, recommended his release. He was set free on the security of Narayana Raju and his diwan Saugy Ramachandra Raju, who insisted that he should reside at Vizianagaram and not quit it without the Collector's consent³⁷.

Vijayarama Raju was quiet till May 1811, when he again fomented disturbances and, assembling peons at Viraghattam, collected the revenues in its vicinity and oppressed the people³⁵. Martial Law was proclaimed, army was sent out and a reward was offered for his apprehension³⁶. He ultimately retired to Nagpore. Nothing is known of him thereafter, but according to Russell, his son, Venkatapati Raju, "subsequently induced him to come in to him, and he was afterwards taken to Vizagapatam where he died"³⁷.

Venkatapati Raju was 'dissolute' and lavish. Such "is the wasteful extravagance of the Zamindar that although he has collected about Rs. 30,000 more than the permanent peshcash, he has altogether dissipated the revenue which should have been paid to government and is himself in a sad state of embarrassment. He cannot be persuaded to reduce his foot and establishment or to moderate in any way his profuse expenditure, and so wanting is he in dignity, so forgetful of the responsibility of his ancestors and so thoughtlessly improvident in his mode of living that he has been reduced to the degradation of taking up loans from soucars in the name of his diwan as well as from his principal ryots in anticipation of future kists"³⁸. Because of defaults, his country was annually sequestered³⁹, and restored on the security of his diwan, Jagannatha Patrudu who was responsible for the liquidation of

the balance within a stipulated period⁴⁰. In Fasli 1237 (1827-28) the Zamindar gave him Rs. 20,000 desiring him to pay to the Government. As the money was insufficient and arrived too late, the Aumeen was sent out.

On 16 February 1828, a large body of armed men under Venkataraidoo, a powerful Mocassarar and his nephew Apparaidoo attacked the diwan in the palace and killed him and his brother and severely wounded one, Boganna Patrudu. They "were not only allowed to quit the Zamindar's house, but to walk quietly out of the fort in which were three hundred armed peons belonging to the Zamindari and made their escape into the neighbouring hills"⁴¹. Although the Zamindar's conduct created suspicion, there was no 'legal proof' without which the Magistrate did not capture the 'powerful' Zamindar possessing an extensive hill country, "almost inaccessible to the inhabitants of the plains fatally noted for the insalubrity of its air, and inhabited by a turbulent race of the Zamindar's own dependents". But he on 20 February offered rewards for the apprehension of Venkataraidoo and Apparaidoo.

On 29 September the Zamindar, ⁴² who was long infirm, died leaving three sons named Kurma Raju, Vijayarama Raju and Neeladri Raju, three daughters and eight widows, most of whom were not married to him, namely, (1) Pedda Lakshminarasiah, his married wife, (2) Pedda Jaggiah, a dancing girl, (3) Seetaiah, a 'gentoo' woman, (4) Kamalia of the same class, (5) Chinna Jaggiah - sister of Kamalia and mother of second son, (6) Sundariah - sister of Kamalia and Chinna Jaggiah, (7) Venkata Lakshmiaiah of the 'cultivating' class, mother of the third son,

and Subhadriah of the silversmith caste ⁴³. The arrears were Rs. 45,095-13-10⁴⁴.

The mother of the eldest son was a dancing girl, but upon the representation of the Collector that he was universally acknowledged as the lawful Zamindar, he was recognized⁴⁵, and, as he was a minor of fifteen years, the Zamindari was placed under the Court of Wards⁴⁶. In May 1829 Kamalia, his adoptive mother, was appointed⁴⁷. regent and one Padmanabha Charyulu was made his guardian⁴⁸. But dissensions continued and in 1831 the minor quarrelled with his adoptive mother, joined another of the widows. This roused some of the leading hill 'doratanums' opposed to the regent who to embarrass her, "as much as for their own immediate advantage" created disturbances. The minor had powerful influence "which is usual with persons of his dignity in hill countries"⁴⁹ and the regent tolerated it. The Collector tried to reconcile them in vain.

In March 1832 Kurma Raju submitted an 'Arzee' requesting the Government that he might be allowed to assume the Zamindari, engaged to clear the arrears of Rs. 81,248-10-0 at the rate of Rs. 15,000 per annum and offered the security of some villages, whose revenue was estimated at Rs. 16,000 and a deposit of Rs. 15,000 to cover any deficits⁵⁰. The Board of Revenue approved this and authorized the Collector to deliver over the Zamindari. Yet, even by August, because of disturbances, he could not pay the deposit and the Zamindari continued under the Collector⁵¹.

By the end of 1832, feuds in the Zamindar's family and the intrigues of persons about the samsthanam for influence "each striving to do the other

injury by enlisting the hill Doratanams on his side and through their instrumentality perpetrating all kinds of violence"⁵² reached the climax and the Zamindari was in revolt. A body of armed men even attacked military pickets and villages were plundered. The situation was uncontrollable and martial law was proclaimed. On 16 January 1833⁵³, the insurgents attacked the Aumeen in charge of Palakonda to rescue a peon Kistnama Dora, a rebel. They were repulsed and they fled, leaving one killed and eight imprisoned, including their leader, Padmanabha Dora. To procure their release, extensive operations were organized. They assembled in a fort at Atsapavalasa, near Palakonda; and, on 9 March⁵⁴, Lt. Curre, commander at Palakonda, attacked them. After stiff resistance, they escaped leaving behind letters addressed to the leading insurgents by the Zamindar and his family, revealing "the continuity and complexity of the intrigues of which Palakonda was the centre during [this period, and of the countenance and support given to the rebel, whom each party in turn applied to for the accomplishment of their own purposes, by any means however atrocious]"⁵⁵. Perusing them, the Commissioner, Russell, in May 1833,⁵⁶ to achieve the object 'quietly' and without any resistance, despatched Colonel Muriel, commanding a field force, to aid the civil authority. As the troops were accustomed to march in the country, their movement excited no suspicion; and, they could get into the fort, surrounded the buildings including the palace before resistance and the family was captured without resort to force and sent to Vizianagaram for trial by the Native Court Martial⁵⁷. Regarding Pedda Jaggiah the proceedings were quashed before

the trial ended and she was made a State prisoner. The others were sentenced to death. But only the diwan and another were executed. The Zamindar and his family were removed to Vellore. Even though Russell recommended the restoration⁵⁸ of the Zamindari to a son of Venkatapati Raju, Frederick (25 October 1832-4 March 1837), the Governor, referred to the opinion of Munro that "no Zamindari forfeited for rebellion should ever be restored" and proclaimed the forfeiture 'absolute'.

Thus, for forty years, owing to the delinquency and contumacy of Vijayarama Raju, the dissoluteness and extravagance of Venkatapati Raju, the dissonant interests of the widows and the incapacity and complicity of Kurma Raju, confusion and bloodshed prevailed in Palakonda. The family disputes and internal troubles and struggles by 1833 menaced the Company and basically contributed to the forfeiture. The Palakonda family languished at Vellore and the Palakonda 'Samstanum' disappeared.

GOLGONDA :

Golgonda was an ancient Zamindari. It was an inaccessible 'country' and of "so pernicious a climate, that natives not particularly inured to it as well as Europeans have even suffered very severely when duty has obliged them to reside there"⁵⁹. It was bounded by the Jeypore and Rampa 'countries' to the west, the Madugula Zamindari to the north, the Kottakota and Vemalapudi 'districts' to the east and the 'Peddapore' Zamindari to the south. It consists of the low country and the hills. Unlike many hill Zamindaris, it had no plain in the east; and, hence, "its cultivation was scanty and circums

cribed, its climate unhealthy and its inhabitants poor and greatly in want of civilization, circumstances that must of course ever tender its resources precarious"⁶⁰. These geographical features influenced its history.

The first of the Jeypore family, says Carmichael, had for his umbrella holders, two cousins of his own, whom he elevated as feudatories, at Golgonda and Madugula respectively with the title of 'Bhupati'⁶¹. Thus Nilakanta Bhupati 'obtained the country'⁶². Now Golgonda is a village ten miles west of Narsipatnam. The name might be a corruption of Gollakonda, 'the hill of the Gollas', a race of shepherd kings.

The Golgonda rulers later became tributary to Vizianagaram. The English required the relinquishment of this supremacy.

Virabhupati was the Zamindar during John Andrews' (July 1769-August 1772) Chiefship⁶³. He engaged to pay Rs. 5,000 annually; but he defaulted and began to ravage the country. The Company shirked coercion because of the nature of this region, and, considering that transfer to Vijayarama Raju would spare them the trouble, they did so in 1774⁶⁴ and assisted him with two battalions. Then he expelled Virabhupati. Soon, he submitted and was restored with a settlement of Rs.19,000⁶⁵. When he defaulted again in 1776, his country was put under Vizianagaram which should pay annually Rs. 5,000⁶⁶. But in 1777 taking advantage of the disputes between the brothers, Virabhupati occupied the Zamindari without acquainting the Government or Vijayarama Raju.

In 1779 the Chief and Council, on the request of Sitarama Raju⁶⁷, despatched two companies and a 'field piece' and it again came under Vizianagaram⁶⁸.

Even after 1780 the Golgonda Zamindars continued their disturbances⁶⁹ and Vizianagaram even under Sitarama Raju could not control it and extract the jama fully. To establish peace and order, the Government restored the Zamindari to Bhairava Bhupati at Rs. 22,000⁷⁰. In 1784 the Committee of Circuit proposed to continue him as feudatory to Vizianagaram many of whose fertile districts adjoined Golgonda and whose sibbendies alone were competent to deal with his recalcitrance⁷¹.

In 1785 Bhairava Bhupati was assassinated by Malla Bhupati⁷². Disturbances recurred persistently⁷³. Order was restored and Malla Bhupati and his group were imprisoned⁷⁴. Thereafter Chinna Bhupati became the Zamindar. But he was not regular in his payments and by 1791 he owed arrears of two years. On 15 October Sitarama Raju sent Ramachandra Raju to collect it. He treacherously circumvented the Zamindar and his officers and killed them. The relatives of Chinna Bhupati attacked and slew him and most of his party⁷⁵. Then because of the concurrent circumstances, Malla Bhupati was released and restored⁷⁶. At the time of sequestration of Vizianagaram in 1793 he held it at Rs. 23,000⁷⁷.

Thus from 1769 to 1793 Golgonda, susceptible to frequent disturbances provoked by the petty hill leaders and to disputes among the members of the family for succession or sufficient allowances, proved a tough problem to the Company and Vizianagaram. To keep it under control was an uphill task to Vizianagaram.

nagaram and often it had to apply for military assistance of the Company which was always forth - coming.

Amidst the 'convulsions' which troubled Vizianagaram, its southern division continued "if not in a state of perfect and uniform tranquillity at least not altogether improvident in regard to the state of its cultivation"⁷⁸. Even though Malla Bhupati did not revolt, his payments were tardy and his conduct was not 'satisfactory'. In 1795 despite the 'indifference of his conduct' and 'total insufficiency', as he was 'in a state of quiet'⁷⁹ Webb allowed him to continue. Finding his receipts from 'the country extremely limited' he in 1796 at the time of the settlement with the hill Zamindars fixed the jama at Rs. 11,000⁸⁰. In that year a partial disturbance occurred as one Ramanapatrudu wanted to replace him with Krishna Bhupati of fourteen years. But the plot was discovered in time by the Collector and the Zamindar, the conspirators were dispersed and Ramanapatrudu was imprisoned⁸¹. At the time of the Permanent Settlement, the jama was fixed at Rs. 10,000 in perpetuity. Even after 1804 Malla Bhupati defaulted⁸². As the local circumstances did not "so easily admit of carrying into effect the acts of the Regulation" and as the country was impervious to troops, the Collector could not extract the jama⁸³.

In 1805 Malla Bhupati died and Krishna Bhupati succeeded him. But there was no improvement in the payment of jama, and, he was in arrears as he could not collect the revenue from the hill sardars, lest they should resist; and, the Zamindari did not yield the average net collections on which the Permanent Settlement was fixed⁸⁴. His credit also suffered

as the Zamindari was decreed to Ananta Bhupati, a minor of fifteen years. In 1809 the Zamindar appealed to the Provincial Court and, pending it, the Collector sequestered⁸⁵ and rented it in 1810 to Devarapally Appiah for three years⁸⁶. The balance then due was Rs. 12,258-8-0. In 1811 Ananta Bhupati was declared heir by the Provincial Court⁸⁷, and the Collector assumed the Zamindari as it came under the Court of Wards⁸⁸.

In 1812, on the request of Ananta Bhupati, the Collector restored the Zamindari to him after taking security for the balance due⁸⁹. As the Zamindar was imbecile, the estate was managed by the diwan, Punnapotula Naganna Dora,⁹⁰ who was very influential. He restrained the Zamindar⁹¹ with a monthly stipend. The Zamindar, a 'cypher', did not interfere. The sardars or hill chiefs were not permitted to communicate with him⁹². Still the Zamindari was in arrears amounting to Rs. 7,900 in 1828⁹³. As Golconda "is perhaps with the exception of Jeypore, the Zamindari in which above all others the Collector's interference can be least effectually exerted"⁹⁴ and as the "difficulty of access to these mountain regions, the unhealthiness of the climate and the inveterate devotion of the inhabitants to the will of their feudal chiefs have rendered all attempts at forcible interference abortive",⁹⁵ the Collector had to try "judicious remonstrance" and favoured Naganna Dora "without whose acquiescence no aumeen can collect one rupee".

By 1832, both the Zamindar and the diwan were greatly reduced to poverty. When there were disturbances in the southern part of the district, they helped the cause of the insurgents by supplying all

the essentials and advised them to better their finances by plunder. It was felt that "if he were to be removed from the district peace would be almost immediately restored"⁹⁶. A detachment was sent. On 16 July 1832 pardon was proclaimed to those insurgents who immediately returned to their homes. On that day Naganna Dora, with numerous retainers, repaired to the valley which they occupied but evacuated on his departure. On 19 July the Company withdrew the troops⁹⁷. In 1833 some 'unknown assassins' killed Naganna Dora⁹⁸. Despite some defects, he was a good administrator and commanded respect of hill sardars. There were no serious disputes during his management. The arrears were caused by several factors natural to the period and inherent in the hill Zamindaris. His death marked the beginning of the end of the Zamindari.

After his death disorder aggravated. Jamma-devamma, the grandmother of Ananta Bhupati, began to manage. As the Zamindari was advertized for sale, she came to Vizagapatam with full authority to prevent it. As the weakness and imbecility of the Zamindar were notorious, she could not procure loans in his name but she was told that money could be procured if the Zamindari was transferred to her. She applied for transfer and on consent of the Zamindar it was transferred. During her absence, his mind was poisoned and her life was threatened. So, she fled into the Rajahmundry district and solicited Collector's protection. The Zamindar stated that his arzee of consent was forgery and demanded investigation. The country was then attached for arrears and troops were sent to support the civil authority⁹⁹.

In 1834 on the assurance of the Collector Jammadevamma returned to the Zamindari and was reconciled to Ananta Bhupati¹⁰⁰. But he was liable to the influence of some turbulent people and troubled her; yet, nothing serious occurred until the end of February 1836. The hill-sardars or muttadars, who objected that they had not been consulted, that no woman had ever ruled them before, favoured Ananta Bhupati, felt that she was his only obstacle to recover the Zamindari and supported him openly. They, after an unsuccessful attempt to kill her in February, abducted her on the night of 18 May and murdered her¹⁰¹. Freese the Collector, sent troops and confiscated the estate. Ananta Bhupati was convicted of complicity in the murder and was confined at Gooty¹⁰² in Anantapur, where he subsequently died. In 1837 the Zamindari was auctioned and bought by Government for Rs. 100.

Internal feuds, domination of hill sardars and physical features figured prominently in the history of Golgonda and scenes of confusion and bloodshed prevailed throughout this Zamindari for thirty years. After the insurrection in 1837 Golgonda like Palakonda became the property of Government and a ryotwari settlement was introduced.

* * *

REFERENCES

- 1 W. Francis, District Gazetteer for Vizagapatam, p. 287.
- 2 Ibid.
- 3 Arzee from the Zamindar of Jeypore to the Collector dated 7 January 1822. Collector to BOR, 25 March 1822, v. D. R. (4735 : 137). See also Kumar Bidyadhar Singh Deo, Nandapur (A Forsaken kingdom) (Jeypore, 1938), Vol. I, p. 57.
- 4 D. F. Carmichael, A Manual of the District of Vizagapatam, p. 313.
- 5 Zamindar of Palakonda to the Collector, Collector to BOR, 25 March 1822, v.D.R. (4735 : 165).
- 6 Palakonda Vijayarama Raju to BOR. Gregory to BOR, 27 April 1794, v.D.R. (3700 : 58). But according to the letter of the Chief and Council to the President and Select Committee "Palakonda became a tenure of the Vizianagaram family" in 1752 when Jafarally Khan was expelled by the "ancestor of the present Zamindar of Vizianagaram, obviously Pedda Vijayarama Raju. 15 November 1779, v. D. R. (3683 : 149).
- 7 Gregory to BOR, 16 February 1794, v. D. R. (3699 : 128).
- 8 Chief and Council to the President and Select Committee, 15 November 1779, v. D. R. (3683:150)

- 9 Ibid.
- 10 Sitarama Raju to the Chief, 31 May 1779, v.D.R. (3683 : 56).
- 11 Chief and Council to the President and Select Committee, 15 November 1779, v.D.R. (3683:152)
- 12 13 December 1779, v. D. R. (3683 : 178)
- 13 Report of the Committee of Circuit, p. 16.
- 14 12 May 1793, v. D. R. (3696 : 192), 9 July 1794, v. D. R (3700 : 343).
- 15 Palakonda Vijayarama Raju to BOR, 27 April 1794, v. D. R., (3700 : 56).
- 16 2 August 1793, v. D. R. (3696 : 328).
- 17 Gregory to BOR, 27 April 1794, v.D.R. (3700:57)
- 18 Palakonda Vijavarama Raju to BOR, 27 April 1794, v. D. R., (3700 : 58).
- 19 8 September 1794, v. D. R. (3702 : 105).
- 20 23 September 1794, v.D.R. (3702 : 207).
- 21 8 September 1794, v.D.R. (3702 : 105)
- 22 23 September 1794; v.D.R. (3702 : 209).
- 23 10 February 1795, General Reports of BOR, paras 140, 141.
- 24 Gregory to BOR, 2 November 1794, v. D. R. (3703 : 188)
- 25 Thomas Dunwoody to Webb, 5 March 1795, v.D.R. (3704A : 85-90).

- 26 Thomas Dunwoody to Webb, 16 April 1795, v. D. R. (3704B : 480).
- 27 29 April 1795, v. D. R. (3704B : 591).
- 28 Secretary to the Government to the Collector, 11 November 1795, v. D. R. (3704B : 873-74).
- 29 Webb to BOR, 5 January 1797, BORC, p. 94.
- 30 30 June 1796, General Reports of BOR, para 45.
- 31 Webb to BOR, 5 January 1797, BORC, p. 95.
- 32 Ibid.,
- 33 1 October 1798, General Reports of BOR, paras 80, 81.
- 34 G.E. Russell. Report on the Disturbances in Purlakimedy, Vizagapatam and Goomsoor, Vol. I, p.7.
- 35 Arzee of Venkatapati Raju, 15 October 1811, v. D. R. (3727 : 495-97). Also 14 November 1811, v. D. R. (3727 : 200).
- 36 Magistrate to the Collector, 2 July 1811, v.D.R. (3727 : 289).
- 37 G.E. Russell, Op.Cit., p. 8.
- 38 Collector to BOR, 15 August 1827, v. D. R. (4740 : 102-03).
- 39 Collector to BOR, 11 April 1811, v. D. R. (3727 : 200), 1 August 1812, v.D.R. (3749 : 159), 13 June 1814, v.D.R. (3730A : 116-17) and 28 March 1816, v.D.R. (3754 : 110).

- 40 Magistrate to the Judicial Secretary to Government, 28 March 1828, v.D.R. (4774 : 88-98).
- 41 Ibid.,
- 42 Collector to BOR, 6 October 1828, v. D. R. (4740 : 279).
- 43 G. E. Russell, Op. Cit., p. 9
- 44 Collector to BOR, 6 October 1828, v. D. R. (4740 : 281).
- 45 Collector to Court of Wards, 9 May 1829, v.D.R. (4741 : 104).
- 46 Collector to BOR, 10 November 1831, v. D. R. (4743 : 400).
- 47 Collector to Court of Wards, 9 May 1829, v.D.R. (4741 : 104),
- 48 Collector to BOR, 9 November 1829, v. D. R. (4741 : 328).
- 49 Collector to BOR, 20 May 1831, v. D. R. (4743: 139-53)
- 50 10 March 1832, v. D. R. (4774 : 76-83).
- 51 BOR to the Collector, 26 March 1832, v. D. R. (4758 : 133-35).
- 52 Collector to BOR, 24 August 1832, v.D.R (4774: 365-73).
- 53 Collector to BOR, 10 September v.D.R. (6638: 467)
- 54 G. E. Russell, Op. Cit., p-14

- 55 G. E. Russell, Op. Cit., p. 20
- 56 G. E. Russell, Op. Cit. pp. 25-26.
- 57 G. E. Russell, Op. Cit., p. 26
- 58 G. E. Russell, Op. Cit., p. 46
- 59 Correspondence Relative to the Permanent Settlement of Zamindaris in the late second Division of Vizagapatam, p. 17.
- 60 Ibid.
- 61 D. F, Carmichael, Op. Cit., p. 316. Also Memorial of the Ancestors of Ramachandra Deo, Zamindar of Jeypore, 25 March 1822, V. D. R. (4735 : 131).
- 62 Zamindar of Golconda to the Collector, 25 March 1822, v. D. R. (4735 : 146).
- 63 16 September 1772, v. D. R. (3681 : 183)
- 64 27 December 1774, RC (1 : 224)
- 65 Chief to BOR, 9 July 1794, v. D. R. (3700 : 342)
- 66 Report of the Committee of Circuit p.16.
- 67 Sitarama Raju to the Chief, 31 May 1779, v.D.R. (3683 : 56)
- 68 Resolution of the Chief and Council, 31 May 1799, v. D. R. (3714 : 57)
- 69 Vijayarama Raju to the Chief and Council, 24 December 1777, RC (5A : 11).

- 70 Statement of the Gross Revenue of the Zamindar under the Vizianagaram Family, 30 August 1783 v. D. R. (3686 : 375).
- 71 Report of the Committee of Circuit, p. 16
- 72 28 July 1785, v.D.R. (3688 : 195-96)
- 73 5 February 1786, v. D. R. (3689 :35).
- 74 15 June 1787, v. D. R. (3691 : 124-25).
- 75 Vijayarama Raju to the Chief, 13 November 1791, RC (40A : 2107).
- 76 Webb to BOR, 5 January 1797, BORC, p. 92
- 77 "Jumabundy and Kistbundy Account of Vizianagaram Zamindari", 26 August 1793, v D.R. (3697 : 407).
- 78 Snow to BOR, 11 and 12 March 1794, v. D. R. (3699 : 146, 182, 191-92).
- 79 Snow's Minute, 30 August 1794, v. D. R. (3702 : 33-35).
- 80 Webb to BOR, 5 January 1797, BORC, p 93
- 81 Brown to Webb, 6 and 20 January and 2 February 1797, v. D. R. (3709 : 27-28, 57-65, 95-96, 155-58).
- 82 Collector to BOR, 2 September 1804, v. D. R. (3741 : 216)
- 83 Collector to BOR, 18 July 1805, v. D. R. (3721: 106).

- 84 Collector to BOR, 11 July 1807, v. D. R. (3744: 119).
- 85 Collector to BOR, 21 February 1809, v. D. R. (3746 23-24).
- 86 Collector to the Judge and Magistrate, 7 November 1810, v. D. R. (3747 : 394).
- 87 20 June 1811 v. D. R. (3727 : 271:72).
- 88 Collector to BOR, 12 October 1811, v. D. R. (3727 : 438)
- 89 Collector to BOR, 8 August 1812, v. D. R. (3749 : 178).
- 90 20 July 1818, v. D. R. (3756 : 298).
- 91 Collector to the Special Commission for revising the system of Internal Administration, Madras, 10 April 1817, v. D. R. (3764 : 118). See also G. E. Russell, Op. Cit., p. 6.
- 92 Collector to BOR, 22 December 1829, v. D. R. (4741 : 448).
- 93 Collector to BOR, 21 October 1828, v. D. R. (4740 : 293).
- 94 Collector to BOR, 22 December 1829, v. D. R. (4741 : 447).
- 95 Collector to BOR, 21 October 1828, v. D. R. (4740 : 293).
- 96 Acting Sub-Collector to the Acting Magistrate, 22 May 1832, v. D. R. (4777 : 24 27)

- 97 Acting Sub-Collector to the Acting Magistrate,
25 September 1832, v. D. R. (4777 : 50-54).
- 93 G. E. Russell, Op. Cit., p. 6.
- 99 5 January 1834, v.D.R. (476 : 1-7).
- 100 Magistrate to G. E. Russell, 10 June 1836, v.D.R.
(6639 : 348).
- 101 Magistrate to the Chief Secretary to the Govern-
ment, 30 May 1836, v.D.R. (6639 : 300-02).
- 102 Collector to BOR, 30 June 1837, v. D. R. (6641 :
312-26).

CHAPTER VII.

Passive Sub-Feudatory Zamindaris

JEYPORE :

Jeypore was an ancient Zamindari in the district of Vizagapatam. Lying west of the other hill Zamindaris and most extensive, it "exhibits such a tract not only of uncultivated but uninhabited forest, that its revenue bears no kind of proportion to its extent"¹.

The original place of residence of the Zamindars was Nandapuram, which fell into ruin, as they moved to central and strategic Narayanapatnam to defy the Nawabs of Chicacole. Vikrama Deo (1758-81) after driving out his brother Lala Krishna Deo, built Jeypore, on the border of the Maratha 'country' and the family resided there ever since.

"The country was formerly held by a Silavamsam ruler, who reigned at Nandapore when the ancestors of the present house were retainers of the Gujapatty rulers of Cuttack. About the fifteenth century Vinayaka Deo, the founder, a Rajput of the Lunar line is said to have married a daughter of the Gujapetty ruler, who bestowed this principality upon him, on the extinction of the old line of the Nundapore chiefs. To secure his pretensions with the wild races of the highlands, the new feudatory took for his second wife the last surviving princess of the ancient stock of Silavamsam rulers. Whatever their origin it is certain that an ancestor of the Jeypore family was in possession, not only of the country comprised in the limits of the Jeypore Zamindari as

it now stands, but of all the present hill Zamindaries which lie at the base of the Ghauts, when the founder of the Vizianagaram Raj came to Chicacole about...1652''².

During the Muslim Government Nandapuram paid a yearly tribute of Rs. 25,000 as noted by the Committee of Circuit, for itself and Madugula, Srugavarapukota, Salur, Tada-Pachepenta, Kurupam, Gunapuram, Rayagada, and other hilly 'countries' under it. But the Muslims, finding that this small tribute inadequate to control them, granted the hill region as jagir to Vizianagaram which assumed that responsibility.

In 1752 Lala Krishna Deo became the Zamindar. When Pedda Vijayarama Raju went to Masulipatam to settle the jama with the French, he encouraged 30,000 Maratha horse to intrude into the country. The Raja on his return, defeated them at Tummapalem in 1753. He allowed Singapuram only for his subsistence, and supported his step brother Vikrama Deo in the succession dispute and obtained Madugula, Kasipuram, Andra, Salur, Pachipenta, Chemudu, Belgaum, Sangamvalasa and Kurupam.

In 1768 Chinna Vijayarama Raju wrote to Madras that in 1752 Salabat Jang had granted him Jeypore as a jagir for Rs. 24,000 and requested its renewal. In 1769 the Governor and Council granted a kaul to him³.

Vikrama Deo proved deceitful and leagued with the other Zamindars. In 1774, during Kimidi disturbances, he threatened to support the insurgents. Sitarama Raju assisted by Captain Richard Mathews

subdued him and gave him only Jeypore for Rs. 3,000 and occupied the rest of the Zamindari. As he proved faithful, Sitarama Raju, later on, rented to him the rest of the Zamindari also for Rs. 32,000. In 1780 Sundaranarayana Deo, son of Lala Krishna Deo, fomented troubles and Captain Mayne, Commanding at Merangi, expelled him⁴.

In 1781 Vikrama Deo died and his son Ramachandra Deo II (1781-1825) succeeded him. At the time of the appointment of the Committee of Circuit he paid a jama of Rs. 31,200. In its report the Committee proposed to constitute Jeypore into a separate Zamindari with a jama of Rs. 35,000⁵.

In May 1786 Sundaranarayana Deo, assembling 4,000 hill people, entered the Zamindari and occupied Singapuram and Rayagada. By the end of June Vizianagaram and the Company quelled the disturbances in the hills and Sundaranarayana Deo left the district after burning Rayagada⁶.

Ramachandra Deo continued to pay his usual jama. In 1792 being displeased with him, Sitarama Raju rented the Zamindari to Sundaranarayana Deo for Rs. 50,000 who agreed to present him a lakh of rupees. He sent Sundaranarayana Deo with two companies of sepoys into Narrainpatnam Kota; and, afterwards, Vijayagopala Raju and other sirdars with some companies of sepoys were sent to assist Narayana Deo and molest Ramachandra Deo who opposed them at the 'Ghats', blocked up Narayana Deo in the said fort and commenced hostilities⁷.

Thus during this period the Jeypore Zamindars were under Vizianagaram, having lost all their past glory and power. Throughout this period they did

not pay the jama regularly. It being a hilly Zamindari, the Pusapatils could not control them fully.

From 1794 the Company alone had to face many disturbances in the district as they came into direct contact with the former feudatories of Vizianagaram; and thus to establish effective control over them. Ramachandra Deo was aloof from the insurgents and on the favourable report of Webb in January 1795⁸, Lord Hobart, the Governor, granted a sanad to him and his heirs in perpetuity at Rs. 25,000. When the Permanent Settlement was introduced in 1803 it was reduced to Rs. 16,000.

This full hill Zamindari was unhealthy and from 1803 to 1818 it was an unknown 'country' to the officials. Even at the time of the Permanent Settlement no accounts of kurnums of the Zamindari were received; and, the permanent assessment was fixed on the Zamindar's statement which only specified the gross revenue without any other details⁹.

During this period there were disturbances because of the differences between Zamindars and their relations and other rebels like Nammah Cherna-Deo¹⁰ hampering cultivation, impoverishing the country, embarrassing the finances and throwing the Zamindar into arrears. Ramachandra Deo until his death in 1825 and his son Vikrama Deo II (1825-60), though the jama was not one tenth part of gross revenue, were extremely remiss in paying it as most of the Zamindari was held by their relations at a nominal rent and the arrears had to be exacted. Even the aumeens never ventured beyond Gunapore. No peon of the Collector "has ever seen the face of the Jeypore Zamindar"¹¹. He could not sell it as it

came "under the class of ancient Zamindaries". So it was sequestered frequently and was under the aumeens until the arrears were collected. Once when the Zamindar defaulted long and coercion seemed to be the only course "the Government proposed to transfer the Zamindari to the Nagpur State, but the offer was declined"¹².

In 1806 Ramachandra Deo dismissed his diwan Jagannadha Patro and in 1811 there were disputes in the family. He separated himself from his eldest wife and eldest son who resided at Jeypore, remaining at Gunaporam. The taluk of Jeypore was managed by Sundaranarayana Patro and the taluk of Gunaporam by Burrack Narrain Patro, sons of old Jagannadha Patro; and they, then having a cause pending in the appeal court of Masulipatam, collected the revenues and remitted them to Masulipatam for their suit; and, the letters of the Collector addressed to the Zamindar were intercepted by them¹³. So, he could not fulfil his engagements and the Collector attached portions of the Zamindari many times.

In 1825 Ramachandra Deo died and his son Vikrama Deo II (1825-1860) succeeded him. He was feeble and left the Zamindari to the managers. They secretly collected money and satisfied his private creditors. In 1829 Mukunda Deo, his disaffected relative, created disturbances on the frontier¹⁴. Arrears remained and the Zamindari was virtually under attachment and in convulsion.

Although the Jeypore Zamindari thus had a distinct place in the history of the district and presented initial difficulties because of its geographical factors¹⁵, it gradually came under the direct and effective British control from 1796 onwards.

The Zamindari of Bobbili, next in value to Vizianagaram to which it forms the northern boundary, "exhibits a tract of country, as compact in its situation and as productive for its size, as any Zamindari in the Vizagapatam district, commencing at the foot of the hills situated on the east side of the Salur Zamindari it continues in almost a direct line east, having Palcondah on the north and part of Vizianagaram on the south, to within eight miles of the sea on which side it is bounded by the Chicacole Havelly and the whole course of this range of about 30 miles, is marked by a fertility of soil which continues with fewer interruptions than are to be met with in almost any other part of the country"¹⁶.

According to family papers, the founder was Pedda Ravadu, fifteenth in descent of the Rajas of Venkatagiri and so a Velama. In 1652 he entered the district with Sher Muhammad Khan. Another retainer of the Faujdar was Pusapati Madhavavarma; and, the rivalry between the two houses dates from now. For his services, Pedda Rayadu was eventually granted the Rajam hunda.

His son and successor, Lingappa, selected Bobbili as head-quarters, built a fort, founded the town and called it Pedda Puli as a compliment to 'Sher' (tiger), Muhammad Khan the patron of the family. Later, the Faujdar granted him the hereditary title of Ranga Rao¹⁷.

The other successors were Vengala Rao (adopted), Rangapati Rayadappa and Gopalakrishna (adopted). During the period of the last named at the end of 1753, the Northern Circars were assigned to the

French. In 1756 the defiance of the Zamindars invited repression, and, Bussy marched with a European force. On his arrival at Rajahmundry, Vijayarama Raju visited him and instigated him against his powerful rival, Bobbili. Bussy directed Gopalakrishna to move to another part of the district and this offended him greatly. In January 1757 the famous battle of Bobbili was fought in which only two members of the family, the Zamindar's brother, Vengala Rao and his infant son Venkata Ranga Rao, alias Chinna Ranga Rao, survived.

Vengala Rao and Chinna Ranga Rao, after the death of Ananda Raju, returned to Rajam from Bhadrachalam where they fled in 1757; and, assisted by the Desastuloo expelled the Rajas troops and occupied it. Vijayarama Raju's diwan Gundala Appajee, who marched against him was repulsed. Afterwards Sitarama Raju negotiated with Vengala Rao and got him to Vizianagaram and settled that the 'districts' of Kaviti and Rajam should remain under him at Rs. 20,000 a year. Vengala Rao managed for three years and died.

Chinna Ranga Rao succeeded him and managed for four years. After that he "raised disturbances in the country, made predatory incursions even into the Vizianagaram district"¹⁸, whereupon the Company's troops under Captain Drinning proceeded to reduce them. Kaviti and Rajam came under Sitarama Raju and, Chinna Ranga Rao was imprisoned until 1784. The fort of Rajam was demolished. He was for sometime thereafter "under a sort of parole at Vizianagaram but altho' he was well treated by the Raja, he became tired of his situation and suddenly in May 1790 withdrew from Vizianagaram and went to Hyderabad"¹⁹.

In July 1797 at the invitation of Webb, Chinna Ranga Rao returned and was restored at Rs. 80,000²⁰. Soon, he adopted a distant kinsman, Rayadappa. When he died in 1801, Vizianagaram tried to annex Bobbili, in vain; and in 1803, the Permanent Settlement was made with Rayadappa.

Rayadappa, being a minor his uncle Row Venkata Rayadu managed the affairs of the Zamindari and paid the Revenue as "if the Zamindar had attained the age of maturity and the Zamindari was never placed under the Court of Wards"²¹. In 1807 the Zamindar attained age and took over the administration²².

Rayadappa managed 'very ably' with "the greatest punctuality in the discharge of the Government peshcush"; and, his Zamindari "has never been under sequestration since he has been in possession of it"²³. He kept all land under aumeens, made advances to the ryots and treated them with 'consideration' and 'lenity' when they suffered from bad seasons and other calamities. During his period Bobbili was "the best managed talook.. and a most profitable country". He tried to add by purchases and came into clash with the Collector thereof. The latter requested the Board of Revenue to permit him "to publish that neither the Zamindar of Bobbili by himself, his relations or retainers shall be permitted to purchase or hold by mortgage or rent, any lands in this Zillah in addition to those now forming his present Zamindari of Bobbili. Unless some restrictive measure of this kind is adopted, the domineering character of Ranga Row will not cease to encroach upon and disturb his neighbours, until their disputes at length end in open hostility"²⁴.

In 1830 Rayadappa died and his son Swetachalapati succeeded him. He, like his father, was a great administrator and kept up the name and fame of his Zamindari till his death in 1862.

Thus the Bobbili family, who lost their Zamindari in 1757, regained it after four decades; and, Chinna Ranga Rao, who spent most of his life in Vizianagaram prison, became the Zamindar. Unlike the other Zamindars, Rayadappa and Swetachalapati managed the resourceful Zamindari diligently and developed it. It was the only Zamindari that was never sequestered.

MADUGULA :

Madugula Zamindari was situated to the south of the Srungavarapukota and Antwa paraganas of Vizianagaram which formed its north boundary, Woddady paragana bounded it on the east, the Kottakota estate and Golgonda Zamindari on the south and the wild tract of the Jeypore hills runs behind it to the west. Most of this Zamindari, although classed among the hill Zamindaris, lies to the east of the principal range of hills, and consists of the best soil for agriculture²⁵.

The Zamindars claim to be descendants of the rulers of Matsya Desa. Other accounts say that they came to this place with the founder of Jeypore family and were his cousins and fief-holders, with the title of 'Bhupati'. No details of their history are available until 1769.

When the English obtained the Circars, the Zamindar was Linga Bhupati paying a yearly tribute of Rs. 12,000/- to Vizianagaram. He defaulted in

the time of Vijayarama Raju and even assisted the recalcitrant Kimidi Narayana Deo. In 1769 Vizianagaram obtained a Kaul for Madugula from the Company. In 1770 when Linga Bhupati joined the general revolt against Vizianagaram, he was deposed. He fled to Golconda hills and died there.

His brother, Krishna Bhupati, continued the depredations. He rejected the offer of an allowance of Rs 6,000, was expelled and died soon after. Four years later, his sons Chinnalinga Bhupati and Appala Bhupati, illegitimate son of Linga Bhupati went to Jeypore²⁶ and were sheltered by Ramachandra Deo. In 1787 they persuaded by Jogey Raju, an 'elder relation', entered Madugula and created disturbances²⁷. Amidst these transactions, the Company came to an agreement with them by which "the hill and the four Lovas and some adjacent districts valued at ten or twelve thousand rupees, were promised to rent to them, it having been further stipulated that the countries formerly possessed by the family should be fully restored to them in the space of two months"²⁸. They dissolved it; but they could not devise their future course as they could not defy Vizianagaram and the Company,...

Now the family had matrimonial connections with Ramachandra Deo who married two of his daughters to Jagannadha Bhupati and Chinnalinga Bhupati respectively and provided for their sustenance at Jeypore.

In 1790, aided by the hill sardars of Madugula, Appala Bhupati entered the Zamindari and created troubles. Sitarama Raju prevailed upon him to come to a settlement. It was agreed to pay him an

allowance of Rs. 5,000 annually. But in 1793 when he was called upon to pay Rs. 7,500 for the villages he possessed as allowance, he retired to the hills and started disturbances "in order that the Company may come to the knowledge of" his case and give him the Zamindari²⁹. By May 1793 Jagannadha Bhupati also joined him.

Thus "...among the numerous usurpations of the Pusapati family, Madugula formed a principal object of their avarice and ambition, in the attainment of which under the plea of enforcing their just claims to tribute and allegiance, they derived no inconsiderable assistance from the Company's troops granted to them through the Chief and Council of Vizagapatam..."³⁰.

In the aftermath of the battle of Padmanabham, Jagannadha Bhupati "stuck to the cultivation of the lands in Madugula instead of carrying fire and the sword through the district, in conjunction with that host of poligars who have urged him to this craze in vain and refrained from interrupting the revenues in other parts of the division"³¹. In 1796 Madugula was restored to him despite the contest of Appala Bhupati. But he was under greater disadvantage than the other hill Zamindars as "the Desastaloos of Madugula who were enjoying large allowances in land and money at very advantageous terms", were not 'in any state of subordination', whereupon the Collector supported him with two companies of sibbendies (sepoys); and, "an opposition of this nature in the internal detail of the Zamindari had a very unfavourable operation" upon his revenue and his receipts were "extremely limited"³². In 1803 the Permanent Settlement was made with him in rissud.

Before his 'accession', Jagannadha Bhupati was brought up in 'extreme ignorance' at Jeypore. So he had no knowledge of his affairs and, entrusting it to others, he was immersed "night and day in a state of intoxication"³³. During the life of his wife, Madugula was under Jeypore supervision; but, since her death, Jeypore abandoned it; and, it fell into arrears. Further, Appala Bhupati ravaged it, claiming half of it and occupied the hilly part and collected revenues since 1801³⁴. Jagannadha Bhupati refused to give any allowance to him, as advised by the Collector; and, he did not co-operate with the Collector to expel him as he "rather wished and connived at his depredations to secure an excuse for the non-payment of his kists"³⁵. The Government found it "next to an impossibility"³⁶ to capture or dislodge Appala Bhupati. While rejecting Jagannadha Bhupati's claim for a remission of Rs. 25,963-3-3, collected by Appala Bhupati from 1801-1804,³⁷ the Collector forced him to reconcile himself with his cousin threatening sequestration³⁸. This ultimatum had the desired effect as Jagannadha Bhupati in 1808 reduced the outstanding balance of Rs. 25,550 in 1807 to Rs. 9,830,³⁹ reconciled himself with Appala Bhupati and gave him a pension of Rs. 3,000.⁴⁰ He rented a part of the Zamindari for 12 years to Nadimpally Lutcherauze who agreed to clear the arrears.⁴¹

Despite these arrangements, he proved himself 'totally unfit' being addicted "to every species of debauchery and in almost a continued state of intoxication"⁴² and fell into arrears. So between 1808-1812 the Government attached Madugula many times. By May 1813 his arrears amounted to

Rs. 16,456-6-2 and the amount of the decrees of the Zilla Adawlut Court of Vizagapatam stood at Rs. 3,383-11-9⁴³. On 11 October 1813 as he 'failed to satisfy his private creditors', Madugula was auctioned as ordered by the Board of Revenue on 30 August and 20 September to Chintalapati Royaparaju for Rs 5,600⁴⁴.

Royaparaju, prevented by Jagannadha Bhupati who also levied contributions and resisted his authority,⁴⁵ transferred it in 1814 to one Chinchiladu (Chinchelda) Venkataraju.⁴⁶ In 1816 Jagannadha Bhupati expressing contrition for his past conduct and promising good behaviour, applied for restoration of himself or installation of his eldest son⁴⁷ Linga Bhupati. In 1817 Linga Bhupati was installed with the approval of Ramachandra Deo, his maternal grandfather.⁴⁸

Even Linga Bhupati could not set right Madugula because of his disputes with his needy relatives as he was not as influential as his father with whom he differed⁴⁹. So it was attached several times.

In 1831 Linga Bhupati died and his 'eldest wife' Ramayya succeeded him. In 1832 she transferred the Zamindari to her half brother-in-law, Harihara Bhupati, who however, died the same year and was succeeded by his brother Krishna Bhupati. On 4 September 1833 it was again sold for arrears of Rs. 57,244-11-0⁵⁰ "as the balance was so large there was no possibility of coming to an arrangement with the Zamindar for its liquidation" and was purchased by the Government for Rs. 1,600⁵¹. In 1844 he petitioned to the sub-Collector that "this Zamindari is an ancient one and had been in possession

but his claim was rejected because of his father's rebellion. To keep him quiet Ganga Raju granted many villages, but he was still dissatisfied.

Ganga Raju died soon and the Permanent Settlement was made in 1803 with his son Chandrasekhara Raju. He being a minor the Zamindari came under the Court of Wards. In 1804 Jagannadha Raju filed a complaint for it. He died thereafter and his brother Veerabhadra Raju continued the suit. In 1808 he lost his case in the Zilla and Provincial Courts, could not pay the costs, fled to the hills, revolted, seized the Zamindar, robbed him and his manager of their possessions, collected revenues and twice fought the Company⁵⁵. In 1809, the Collector granted him an allowance of Rs. 1,000, which was increased by Rs. 200 in August 1812, on the condition that "he comes and resides in or near Vizagapatam and gives proper security for his future good behaviour"⁵⁶. In 1816 he renewed disturbances and frequently devastated villages and murdered the Zamindar's grandfather, and, at last after relentless chase, was captured on 28 October 1816 in Jeypore⁵⁷. He was kept under surveillance at Vizagapatam. As the confinement was not strict he renewed intrigues with declared intention of compelling the Zamindar to divide the estate⁵⁸. In 1820 the Collector pressed for his confinement at a place and under such precaution which would prevent his escape; and in 1821 he was removed to Chingleput, where he eventually died.

In 1818 Chandrasekhara Raju, who attained the age, was installed. As he was "in appearance and intellect the worst" and ignorant of management, his mother managed⁵⁹ the Estate. But there was fall

of revenue and the Zamindari was frequently sequestrated. It used to be under the Collector for a long time and he experienced much greater success in realizing collections by means of an aumeen⁶⁰. Still the Zamindar, whom Russell described as "a perfect idiot"⁶¹, by July 1832 fell into arrears amounting to Rs. 26,371-6-8⁶². In 1833 the Zamindari was sold by an order of the Court of Wards to satisfy a private debt; and as there were no bidders it was purchased on 20 June by the Government for Rs. 500⁶³. Even though Mason, the Collector and Russell, the Commissioner, urged its retention, because of its political and geographical importance⁶⁴, the Government, in view of the manager's services in capturing three principal insurgents of Palakonda and as the Zamindari was sold for arrears only, it was restored in 1835 to Jagannadha Raju, son of Chandrasekhara Ruju. He being a minor the Court of Wards took charge of it⁶⁵.

Thus Merangi, from 1796 to 1821, was disturbed by Veerabhadra Raju. The Zamindar was a minor, and, the managers Kolluru Venkanna, Babara Dallanna, Parasuram Patro and Venkatarayadu mismanaged and embezzled large amounts and the Zamindari defaulted. From 1821 to 1833 the embarrassed Zamindar was completely at the mercy of some schemers who retained the management and ruined the Zamindari. Thus its affairs obliged the Company to intervene, set it right and restore it.

KURUPAM :

The Zamindari of Kurupam, including Merangi, was one of those that Vizianagaram 'abolished' and incorporated as a paragana. According to the

tradition it was granted by Visvambhara Deo I of Jeypore to an Uriya named Sanyasi Dora with the title of Vairicherla.

In 1760 Sivarama Raju was the Zamindar of Kurupam and Merangi, upto 1795 generally termed Kurupam Zamindari. He was defaulting and turbulent from the beginning. In 1775, taking an active part in the revolt of the hill Zamindars against Vizianagaram, he attacked the rear-guard of Captain Mathews and Sitarama Raju when it was marching against Jeypore and cut off its supplies. Next year, Sitarama Raju proceeded to Kurupam and treacherously seized Sivarama Raju and his family at an entertainment. They were confined at Devapalli, near Gajapatinagaram. He was afterwards released at the intercession of Vijayarama Raju⁶⁶. In August 1778, he after bribing Mansaram, the subedar of the Kurupam fort, occupied and garrisoned it and fomented troubles in Golconda. On 15 February 1779 a detachment of the Company and Vizianagaram under Lane marched against him. On 17 February they retook the fort, as it was abandoned⁶⁷. He could not go any where and returned to Vizianagaram and was granted two villages as Mokhasa. But within two months he was recalcitrant and his family was brought from Kimidi by the Chief and Council⁶⁸ to Vizagapatam in March 1780. He returned to Vizianagaram and in August was summoned to Vizagapatam by the Chief, who keeping him under surveillance granted him a subsistence allowance of Rs. 400 per month⁶⁹. He remained there until his death in August 1789⁷⁰.

After his death his sons Sanyasi Raju and Sivarama Raju enjoyed the same till 1795.

Thus Vizianagaram once for all subjugated Kurupam with the help of the Company and annexed it.

During the period of confusion after the death of Vijayarama Raju, Venkata Raju, Zamindar of Merangi, whose estate was usurped by Sivarama Raju, occupied the fort of Kurupam and garrisoned it with 1,000 men and defied the Company. When Captain Cox marched against it, it was evacuated and it was destroyed in April 1795. As now, Sanyasi Raju, Sivarama Raju's young son, "conducted himself with much zeal for the service" and his family "by their influence over the inhabitants helped greatly to accelerate the bringing of the country under obedience", it was handed over to him. Merangi was separated and restored to its original holders⁷¹. In 1803 Permanent Settlement was concluded with him.

From 1803 to 1820 it was a story of defaults of the Zamindar and attachments. In 1811 the Zamindar was even imprisoned and his personal property was attached until the arrears were cleared.

In 1820 Sanyasi Raju died and there was a dispute for succession. The claim of Chellamma, widow of the late Zamindar of Kurupam, was rejected and Sitarama Raju, a cousin's son whom he had adopted, succeeded⁷². Disputes continued between him and Chellamma on the one hand and the renter and Pedda Sanyasi Raju, his father on the other, and, the Zamindari which fell into arrears was seized on 19 February 1822. The disputes culminated in the murder of Pedda Sanyasi Raju on 28 October 1823 and the real instigator, Chellamma, fled to the jungles

where she was killed by her own party⁷³. Even after 1824 the Zamindar was in arrears and the Zamindari was attached many times.

In 1830 Sitarama Raju died, followed shortly by his infant son⁷⁴ and again there were three claimants, viz., Subhadramma, the dowager and the other two were the son and the grandson of an illegitimate son of a former Zamindar. As Subhadramma was found to be the legal heir and was competent, she was recognized by June 1831 and directions were given to instal her after the attachment was withdrawn⁷⁶. But she could not pay the arrears which on 1 December 1831 amounted to Rs. 17,912-12-9⁷⁷ and the Collector rejected her proposal that "if he could consent to credit on account of arrears the amount of Rs. 10,600 collected by the Zuft aumeen during the fusly she should pay up the balances" and also the proposal to sell six villages to Bobbili for Rs. 15,300. On 5 December 1831 he bought the Zamindari⁷⁸. But the Board of Revenue in their letter dated 12 March 1832 declined to confirm it as the Collector did not lend her Rs. 10,600 and justify himself in buying the lands on behalf of Government for Rs. 1,000 though Rs. 30,000 was offered; and, they allowed her the privilege of selling the whole or a portion of her Zamindari provided the transfer was effected "in strict conformity with the provisions of sections 8 and 9 of Regulation XXV of 1802"⁷⁹. As her "authority is very weak and her finances are by no means in a flourishing state"⁸⁰ she engaged with Bobbili to transfer three villages and the latter paid Rs. 7,112-10-6, the outstanding amount⁸¹.

Thus from 1795 to 1834 there were family disputes and the Zamindari was attached several times and even sold.

SRUNGAVARAPUKOTA :

Mukhi family were the Zamindars of Srungavarapukota and Kasipuram. About 1750 when Kasipati Raju was the Zamindar, Pedda Vijayarama Raju took the fort of Srungavarapukota. But Kasipati Raju could re-occupy it and his Zamindari. During the period of Bussy this was repeated. He was Zamindar till 1764 when Sitarama Raju proceeded against him in vain as he defaulted and was recalcitrant. But, in his second attempt, Sitarama Raju subjugated him and granted him Rellyseema as a jagir. In 1768 Sitarama Raju upon "suspicion or appearance of insurrection" of Kasipati Raju and his son Rayabhupala Raju, deprived them of the jagir and confined them at Devapalli where the former died,

Rayabhupala Raju remained in prison until 1790 when he escaped and ravaged Srungavarapukota. Pusapati Vijayagopala Raju proceeded against him and concluded a treaty by which Vijayarama Raju granted him Chintada in Bobbili 'district' where he resided and other Mokhasa village amounting to Rs. 6,000 annually. But after a year, pleading the insufficiency of income, he moved to Viragattam where Vijayarama Raju of Palakonda granted him an allowance of Rs. 6,000. Again after one year, he intruded into that region to regain Srungavarapukota; but fearing imprisonment by the Palakonda Zamindar, at the behest of Vizianagaram, fled to Jeypore, returned to Srungavarapukota at the beginning of 1793 and occupied Kasipuram whence forth he and his followers collected revenues thereof⁸².

In 1793 in the general confusion after the sequestration of Vizianagaram, Rayabhupala Raju could

continue at Kasipuram. In 1794 after the death of Pusapati Vijayarama Raju, he, forgetting the old animosities, supported Narayana Raju.

After the submission of Narayana Raju, Rayabhupala Raju was refractory now towards the Company. When the Chief, throughout 1794, demanded his submission, offering a pension of Rs. 6,000 he proffered loyalty, requested restoration of 'his own country' and promised to pay the jama as the Board of Revenue "may think proper to point out"⁸³. But nothing came out of these negotiations and he was recalcitrant till 1796. In August 1796 he repaired to Vizianagaram upon a kaul of safe conduct sent by the Collector. Still, the Collector, in view of his former connections with Palakonda and Jeypore, felt that his present submission did not entitle him to the same indulgence as shown to the other hill Zamindars. But, considering his behaviour before submission and the expediency of affording him some subsistence, the Government granted him Rs. 600 a month⁸⁴.

When restoring the hill Zamindaris, the Collector, unwilling to give to the Pusapati family any footing, kept Kasipuram under himself and leased it first to the Zamindar of Andra and later to Saugy Tirupati Raju, brother of Saugy Ramachandra Raju, Vizianagaram diwan. Observing that Tirupati Raju was a dependant of Vizianagaram and that Kasipuram was too small to be a Zamindari, the Collector assigned it on a separate sanad to Vizianagaram.

In 1801 Narayana Raju's troops, sent by the Collector, killed Rayabhupala Raju who continued to be recalcitrant from 1796. Narayana Raju granted

to his son Virabhadra Raju an allowance of Rs. 200 a month, In 1827, when he handed over the Zamindari to the Collector, Narayana Raju inadvertently omitted this allowance in the list of stipends. Though this was rectified, Virabhadra Raju was aggrieved and was so recalcitrant that in 1832 there was offer of a reward of Rs, 5,000 for his capture. He was chased relentlessly in the hills; and, in January 1833, he was betrayed by one of his own men. He was sent to Gooty in Anantapur district.

Thus Rayabhupala Raju was active, recalcitrant; and, his disposition "to lead the life of an independent Sirdar and his impatience under all kinds of civil restraint"⁸⁵ prevented his reinstatement in any part of his patrimony. This was the only ancient Zamindari that was not restored and was the only addition to Vizianagaram after 1796.

SANGAMVALASA :

According to tradition the founder Ramachandrudu was a favourite of Ramachandra Deo I of Jeypore, who made him Zamindar of Sangamvalasa with the title of 'Nissanka'⁸⁶. His family also was dispossessed by Vizianagaram in 1769.

In 1796 at the time of the restoration of Zamindari families, Webb restored the Zamindari to Venkanna, the representative of the family and, with him the Permanent Settlement was made in 1803.

Venkanna was succeeded by his son Peddanna, "a weak man addicted to drink"⁸⁷. For many years Gangamma one of his three wives managed the Zamindari. His life was rendered miserable owing

to family disputes and he appealed to Bobbili. The latter treated him kindly and gave him refuge. This was criticized by the authorities.

In 1818 the Zamindari was sequestered owing to the 'incapacity' of the Zamindar⁸⁸. In 1819 it was 'attached';⁸⁹ and, on 29 July 1890, it was placed under the Court of Wards as the Zamindar was "imbecile". In 1823 it was rented to his brother Garanna and Gangamma, the eldest wife of the Zamindar for Rs. 9,000. In 1824 Garanna died and the Zamindari was rented to Seetamma, his wife⁹⁰.

In 1829 Peddanna, who was under the protection of Bobbili, died and was succeeded by his posthumous son, Mrutyunjaya⁹¹. He, being a minor, the Zamindari came under the Court of Wards. Medini Raw Narasimha Raju, second brother of Sanyasamma the dowager, was appointed guardian⁹². Seetamma was allowed to continue as the renter for five years until 1836.

Seetamma, being hostile to the family of the minor, collected revenue but defaulted. She paid only a part of the balance when the Collector sequestered the taluks and threatened to sell her property and promised a speedy adjustment of the balance⁹³.

Thus Sangamvalasa suffered most owing to the incapacity of the Zamindar and family feuds in the most critical period (1803-1834). It was the only Zamindari to be under the Court of Wards because of the imbecility of the Zamindar, and to be managed by women for a long period.

SALUR :

The Zamindari of Salur consisted of three paraganas viz., Salur, Ramabhadrapuram and Makkuva. According to tradition, it was granted by Visvambhara Deo of Jeypore to a chief along with the title of 'Boliyaro Simho'.

When the English obtained the Circars the Zamindar was Sanyasi Raju. He was also defaulting to Vizianagaram and joined the revolt against it. So in 1768 Sitarama Raju assisted by Jeypore and Tada Zamindars subdued him, occupied his Zamindari granting Salur as jagir⁹⁴. After his death Sitarama Raju escheated it and in 1770 confined his sons Ramachandra Raju, Bhoji Raju and Appala Raju in Devapalli. They were released in 1793, and sent to Kumili on an allowance of Rs. 260. In 1793, complaining that the allowance was insufficient, they went to Palakonda and were recalcitrant since March 1793.

After the battle of Padmanabham, Ramachandra Raju occupied his Zamindari. As his demeanour, however, was 'unexceptionable', during the period of disturbances, the Collector recognized him.

Ramachandra Raju sub - rented Makkuva to his first cousin Chandrasekhara Raju upon a sanad indefinite, but settling the annual jama at Rs. 14000. When his jama was raised from Rs.40,000 to Rs. 45,000, he increased the jama of Chandrasekhara Raju to 15,750. Instead of paying it fully, Chandrasekhara Raju later claimed the Makkuva paragona arguing that it was granted to his father by Vizianagaram and Jeypore and produced some documents as evidence whose authenticity was questioned by Sanyasi Raju, son of Ramachandra Raju,

who succeeded his father in 1801⁹⁵. He desired to obtain the paragana permanently in vain. The Collector, who had to deal with this important question, was convinced that as the request of Chandrasekhara Raju was unreasonable, it would be unjust to comply with it and made Makkuva a separate Zamindari.

Ramachandra Raju died in 1801 and the Permanent Settlement was made with his son Sanyasi Raju for the whole Zamindari of Salur at Rs. 35,000, ignoring Chendrasekhara Raju. Subsequently Chandrasekhara Raju filed a suit in the Vizagapatam Zilla Adalat (Court against Sanyasi Raju but failed.

Sanyasi Raju personally attended to administration⁹⁶. But the activities of Chandrasekhara Raju affected his resources and he defaulted. He could, some how, pay the arrears.

Sanyasi Raju died in 1830 and his son Narayana Ramachandra Raju succeeded. He was not as good an administrator as his father and the Zamindari soon fell into arrears. On 13 July 1832 his arrears amounted to Rs. 34,813-9-0 and the Zamindari was advertized for sale⁹⁷. In his letter dated 26 July to the sub-Collector, he proposed to liquidate the balance which was accepted and the sale was postponed⁹⁸. In November 1833 the Zamindar in communication with Russell, the Commissioner, transferred five villages to Bobbili who paid off the demand including arrears of Rs.40,000⁹⁹. This transaction later on led to disputes between the two Zamindars. Thus the foregoing survey shows that Salur could never be viable.

PACHIPETA :

According to tradition Tammanna Dora was the

first Zamindar. He was a naik of Jeypore and was appointed by Visvambhara Deo I to guard a ghat which then extended from Pachipenta to Jeypore. It was a post of honour and he was given the title 'Dakshina Kavata Yuvaraju' or lord of the southern portal¹⁰⁰. He built a fort at Tada but his descendants moved down to Pachipenta. The Zamindari was sometimes called 'Teda Pachipenta'. The family styled themselves 'Konda Rajus'.

During the second half of the eighteenth century Virapa Raju was the Zamindar. As he created troubles, Sitarama Raju in 1769 invited him and his son Mallapa Raju to Vizianagaram, imprisoned them and occupied their country. Virapa Raju died in prison and in 1789 his son was released. Sitarama Raju restored to him Tada freely retaining Pachipenta which was rented to a relation of Mallapa Raju "with a view to keep up a division in this family and prevent their action in concert for the recovery of that part of their Zamindari which had been lopped off from it"¹⁰¹.

On the death of Pusapati Vijayarama Raju, Mallapa Raju occupied his Zamindari. He did not, however, refuse to repair to the Collector or to remain there quietly during the troubles. So he was considered the legal heir and the Zamindari was restored to him.

Mallapa Raju died in 1797 and the Permanent Settlement was made with his son Annam Raju. But he died in 1804 and was succeeded by his son Mallapa Raju of 5 years. Throughout his period i. e., 1804-1846, there were feuds between him and

this people and there were skirmishes between the adherents of Zamindar and his relations¹⁰². He was defaulting and he excused himself on the plea of disturbances.¹⁰³. So the Zamindari was sequestered frequently and was under the Collector for a long period¹⁰⁴.

Pachipenta being a hill Zamindari the Company felt it difficult to realize revenue¹⁰⁵. The Zamindar, even though he received an allowance of ten percent¹⁰⁶ on the net collections, collected revenue, violating attachment¹⁰⁷. The Collector could not sell this ancient Zamindari because of the order of the Government prohibiting the sale of ancient Zamindaris. In 1830 the arrears amounted to Rs. 2,094-11-0 and the Collector reported to the Board of Revenue in his letter dated 6 March that "the recovery of which appears to be quite hopeless unless it can be effected by the sale of the estate"¹⁰⁸. In 1831 he tried to sell the Zamindari but thought it advisable to defer it in view of the "paramount" influence of the Zamindar and the difficulty of management for the purchaser¹⁰⁹. The disturbances of 1833 led to attachment again.

Thus, owing to internal feuds and mismanagement of revenues, the Pachipenta Zamindari became and continued even after 1834 as a bankrupt and mismanaged Zamindari.

R E F E R E N C E S

- 1 Correspondence Relative to the Permanent Settlement of Zamindaris in the late second division of Vizagapatam, p. 20-
- 2 Manual of the Administration of the Madras Presidency, f. n. 13, p. 60. See also Memorial of the ancestors of Ramachandra Deo, Collector to BOR, 25 March 1822, v.D.R. (4735 : 130-42).
- 3 Kaul to Vijayarama Raju, 1 August 1769, M.C. (65 : 382-83).
- 4 18 October 1780, v. D. R. (3684 : 172-74).
- 5 Report of the Committee of Circuit, p. 15.
- 6 19 May and 19 June 1786, v. D. R. (3689 : 115-17, 148).
- 7 12 May 1793, v. D. R. (3696 : 192-93).
- 8 V.L. Sastri (ed.), Encyclopaedia of the Madras Presidency and the Adjacent States, (Madras, 1920), p. 404.
- 9 Collector to the Special Commission, 10 October 1815, v. D. R. (3753 : 272).
- 10 Collector to the Secretary to the Government in the Revenue Department, 7 February 1821, v.D.R. (4734 : 148-53).
- 11 Collector to BOR, 21, October 1828, v. D. R. (4740 : 296).

- 12 W. Francis, District Gazetteer for Vizagapatam, p. 268.
- 13 Collector to B O R, 7 March 1811, v. D. R. (3748 : 93-4).
- 14 Collector to BOR, 22 December 1829, v. D. R. (4741 : 443-44).
- 15 Collector to BOR, 15 October 1829, v. D. R. (4741 : 83-93).
- 16 Correspondence Relative to the Permanent Settlement, Op.cit., p. 12.
- 17 Venkata Swetachalapati Ranga Rao, A Revised and Enlarged Account of the Bobbili Zamindari (Madras, 1907), pp. 35-40.
- 18 Collector to B O R, 10 May 1785, v. D. R. (3688 : 121) and 9 July 1794, v D.R. (3700:340-47).
- 19 Collector to BOR, 16 February 1794, v. D. R. (3699 : 118).
- 20 BOR to the Collector, 3 November 1797, v.D R. (3709 : 671-72) and 25 January 1798, General Reports of the BOR, para 25.
- 21 Collector to BOR, 1 September 1807, v. D. R. (3744 : 155).
- 22 Collector to BOR, 11 July 1807, v. D. R. (3744 : 113).
- 23 Collector to BOR, 21 October 1828, v. D. R. (4740 : 287).
- 24 Collector to BOR, 19 November 1817, v. D. R. 3755 ; 365, 371-72).

- 25 Correspondence Relative to the Permanent Settlement, Op. cit., p. 14.
- 26 Collector to BOR, 9 July 1794, v.D.R. (3701:337).
- 27 9, 16 and 23 October 1787, v.D.R. (3691:253-292)
- 28 Representation of Jagannadha Bhupati to John Snow, 5 April 1794, v. D. R. (3699 : 329-334).
- 29 Account of the present situation of the Little States Tributary to the Raja Vijayarama Raju, Chief to BOR, 12 May 1793, v.D.R. (3696 : 191), and Appala Bhupati to the Chief, 2 August 1793) v. D. R. (3696 : 329).
- 30 Correspondence Relative to the Permanent Settlement Op. cit., p. 15.
- 31 Snow's Minute, 30 August 1794, v.D.R. (3702-3)
- 32 Webb to BOR, 5 January 1797 BORC, pp. 84-85.
- 33 Collector to BOR, 8 May 1807, v.D.R. (3744:62).
- 34 Collector to BOR, 8 May 1807, v.D.R. (3744:61).
- 35 Collector to BOR, 8 May 1807, v.D.R. (3744:62).
- 36 17 August 1807, v. D. R. (3744 : 144).
- 37 11 July 1807, v. D. R. (3744 : 118-119).
- 38 26 February 1808, v. D. R. (3745 : 22)
- 39 21 January 1808, v. D. R. (3724 : 59).
- 40 24 May 1808, v. D. R. (3745 : 74).
- 41 *ibid.*

- 42 26 February 1808, v. D. R (3745 : 22).
- 43 Collector to BOR, 20 May 1813, v. D. R.
(3750 : 138-55).
- 44 Collector to BOR, 9 October 1813, v. D. R.
(3751 : 91-92).
- 45 Collector to BOR, 9 December 1813, v. D. R.
(3751 : 137) and 10 February 1814, v. D. R.
(3752 : 383).
- 46 W. Francis, Op.cit., p. 320.
- 47 Collector to BOR, 30 December 1816, v. D. R
(3754 : 465-66).
- 48 Collector to BOR, 29 August 1817, v. D. R.
(3755 : 261, 270).
- 49 Collector to BOR, 21 October 1828, v. D. R.
(4740 : 294) and 27 June 1831, v. D. R (4743:213).
- 50 Collector to BOR, July 1833, v. D. R. (4767 : 16).
- 51 Collector to BOR, 24 November 1833, v. D. R.
(4745 : 492-93).
- 52 Collector to BOR, 16 October 1834. v. D. R.
(4746 : 361-62).
- 53 Sub-Collector to the Collector, 16 October 1834,
v. D. R. (4746 : 359-61).
- 54 Webb to BOR, 5 January 1797, BORC, pp.80-81.
- 55 Collector to BOR, 1 and 5 August, 20 September
1808, v. D. R. (3745 : 117, 213) and 13 December
1808, v. D. R. (3724 : 310-16).

- 56 25 August 1809, v D. R. (2746 : 139-41) and 11 September 1815, v. D. R. (3731A : 329-30).
- 57 27 November 1816, v. D. R. (3754 : 408-18).
- 58 15 August 1820, v. D. R. (3758 : 508).
- 59 Collector to BOR, 29 January 1825, v. D. R. (4738 : 4).
- 60 Collector to BOR, 27 June 1831, v. D. R. (4743:212)
- 61 G.E. Russell, Reports on the Disturbances in Purlakimedy, Vizagapatam and Goomssor, p.31.
- 62 Collector to BOR, 13 July 1832, v. D. R. (4766 : 43-48).
- 63 24 June 1833, v. D. R. (4745 : 209).
- 64 13 August 1833, v. D. R. (4745 : 310-13).
- 65 Collector to BOR, 17 September 1835, v. D. R. (6638 : 482).
- 66 Chief to BOR, 9 July 1794, v D.R. (3700:340-41)
- 67 Lane to the Chief and Council, 22 February 1779, v. D. R. (3683 : 25-26).
- 68 Chief to Jagannadha Deo, 22 March 1780, v. D. R. (36 4 : 34-35).
- 69 23 September 1780, v. D. R. (3684 : 147).
- 70 Chief to BOR, 6 March 1794, v.D.R. (3699 : 156).
- 71 Webb to BOR, 5 January 1797, BORC, pp. 78-80.

- 72 Collector to BOR, 1 July 1820, v. D. R. (3758 : 349-63), 13 July 1820, v. D. R. (3736 : 156-59) and 24 November 1820, v. D. R. (3758 : 659-76).
- 73 Collector to BOR, 21 May 1824, v. D. R. (4772 : 40-41) and 29 January 1825, v. D. R. (4738:32-33).
- 74 Collector to BOR, 18 August 1830, v. D. R. (4765 : 43-44).
- 75 Collector to BOR, 12 October 1830, v. D. R. (4765 : 50-63).
- 76 Collector to BOR, 27 June 1831, v. D. R. (4743 : 212).
- 77 Collector to BOR, 1 December 1831, v. D. R. (4743 : 459).
- 78 Collector to BOR, 14 February 1832, v. D. R. (4766 : 11-15).
- 79 BOR to the Collector, 12 March 1832, v. D. R. (4758 : 97-100).
- 80 Collector to BOR, November 1837, v. D. R. (6641 : 564).
- 81 Collector to BOR, 24 November 1833, v. D. R. (4745 : 487-88).
- 82 Chief to BOR, 9 July 1794, v. D. R. (3700-336).
- 83 Molloy to the Chief, 9 August 1794, v. D. R. (3701 : 197-99) and 12 October 1794, v. D. R. (3703 : 41).
- 84 28 February 1797, General Reports of the BOR, paras 28, 30.

- 85 Correspondence Relative to the Permanent Settlement, Op. Cit., p. 19.
- 86 Tanikella Prakasa Sastri, Srimannisanka Vamsamu (Telugu) (Sangamvalasa Samsthanamu, 1913), pp. 47-50
- 87 Collector to BOR, 19 November 1817, v. D. R. (3755 : 362).
- 88 Collector to BOR, 4 February 1818, v. D. R. (3765 : 70-78).
- 89 Collector to BOR, 12 August 1819, v. D. R. (3735 : 554-55).
- 90 Collector to BOR, 23 September 1835, v. D. R. (6638 : 48).
- 91 Collector to B O R, 6 March 1830, v. D. R. (4742 : 45-60).
- 92 Collector to BOR, 11 February 1831, v. D. R. (4743 : 45).
- 93 Collector to BOR, 24 March 1826, v. D. R. (6639 : 165).
- 94 Chief to BOR, 9 July 1794, v. D. R. (3700 : 338).
- 95 Correspondence Relative to the Permanent Settlement, Op.cit., pp. 23-24.
- 96 Collector to BOR, 11 July 1807, v. D. R. (3744 : 115).
- 97 Collector to BOR, 13 July 1832, v. D. R. (4766 : 43-48).

- 98 Collector to BOR, 2 and 4 August 1832, V. D. R.
(4766 : 62-66, 72-73).
- 99 Collector to BOR, 24 November 1833, V. D. R.
(4745 : 491-92).
- 100 D. F. Garmichael, Op. cit. p. 298.
- 101 Webb to BOR, 5 January 1797, BORC, p. 89.
- 102 Collector to BOR, 22 August 1821, V. D. R.
(4734 : 569).
- 103 Collector to BOR, 18 October 1830, V. D. R.
(4765 : 72)
- 104 Collector to BOR, 19 February 1824, V. D. R.
(4727 : 25-26).
- 105 Collector to BOR, 18 October 1830, V. D. R.
(4765 : 72)-
- 106 Collector to BOR, 23 October 1820, V. D. R.
(3736 : 211).
- 107 Collector to BOR, 21 October 1828, V. D. R.
(4740 : 292).
- 108 Collector to BOR, 6 March 1830, V. D. R.
(4742 : 35).
- 109 Collector to BOR, 27 June 1831, V. D. R. (4743:213)

CHAPTER VIII

Conclusion and Epilogue

Thus the East India Company which established a factory at Vizagapatam in 1682 had no political interests in the district upto 1752 and limited its activities to promote its trade and commerce. It did not entangle itself in the local disturbances but followed a policy of neutrality and always applied itself to obtain trade concessions.

But, in 1753, when the French acquired the Northern Circars, the Company was menaced and it had to counteract, assuming political role also. In 1758 they helped Ananda Raju to expel the French. In 1765 it obtained the grant of Circars from the Mughal Emperor and in 1766 obtained them from the Nizam.

After the acquisition of the Circars, the Company in 1769 took over their direct revenue administration and appointed Chiefs in Councils. In the Vizagapatam district, Vizagapatam was elevated as the regional headquarters and the traders became revenue collectors and eventually rulers.

Even after 1769 the Company's attitude towards the newly acquired 'territory' was that of a trader and its sole object was to collect revenues from the Zamindars. Soon it found it a hazardous task as the Pusapati brothers of Vizianagaram exercised authority over almost the whole district, including the hill region and always tried to evade the tribute. It then, realized the necessity of political authority for revenue purposes. But the peculiar political set up and geographical features of the district, habits and

prejudices of the people, especially of the hills, lack of acquaintance with the people and their language its authority still struggling to rise and the incompetent local administration hampered the consolidation of its authority.

So the Company, even after the receipt of the Report of the Committee of Circuit (1784) and establishment of the Board of Revenue (1786), had to act conjointly with Vizianagaram, in controlling the turbulent hill Zamindaris and establishing peace, order and stable authority. It also could not yet introduce new arrangements to establish its authority firmly over the Zamindars and others. Thus it was obliged to utilize the instrumentality of Vizianagaram upto 1794 when it proved itself a broken reed conclusively.

It followed the general policy of increasing the jama of the Zamindars and reduction of their troops to facilitate the increase of their revenue. Though the Zamindars reduced their forces, they were in arrears because of extravagance.

Vizianagaram was not refractory. But, it did not submit itself completely to the Company, was not amenable to its control and advice, chronically defaulted because of struggle for power of its leaders, and persistent and traditional diseconomy and ultimately was visited with sequestration in 1793.

But this did not improve matters as the local administration could not cope with the local conditions and normalize them. It always had to resort to coercion in its revenue administration. The Board

of Revenue in its letter to the Chief dated 26 April 1794 observed, "Indeed a system has for a long time prevailed which confined the Chief and Council to the mere demand of an inadequate revenue and even this has not been realized without much difficulty and often having recourse to military aid"¹. The records of the period reveal differences between the Board of Revenue and the 'provincial Councils'. These councils "calculated rather for deliberation than for action, whose discussions and dissensions, often interested, impeded instad of accelerating public objects; the members of those boards being but seldom acquainted with the country languages, and trusting the management of affairs to their native dubashes .; were but ill qualified to gain that accurate knowledge of the revenue concerns, and the customs and usages of the country which could enable them...to apply a remedy to prevalent abuses and defects. Those boards could, indeed, be considered only as commercial councils, upon which by accident, the whole political, financial, and revenue administration had fallen; and it was a system, without any defined responsibility; for a great part of the business before it, was transacted by the Chief alone, the Council receiving his report of all personal interviews with the Zemindars and others. The prevalence of native duplicity and counteraction in the servants of the different members, and the commanding influence unavoidably possessed under such a system and under such masters by the head servant of the Chief, operated in themselves, as insuperable obstacles to a just and efficient administration of the revenues, by defeating every wholesome measure that might be adopted for that purpose"². Thus because of their inherent deficiencies and difficult local conditions, the local authorities had to rely upon native

agency of the powerful Vizianagaram for their revenue administration and stabilization. The higher authorities had reluctantly to endorse and put up with this policy. The British had to be wary, opportunist and expedient to gain their ultimate objectives.

It was only in 1794, when Vizianagaram abjectly surrendered after the battle of Padmanabham, that the Company could have a break through and the long awaited opportunity to consolidate its authority in the district. It "to make real progress to a vigorous establishment of their authority or a regular system of revenue management" and towards "settling and systematising" its administration in the district abolished the 'provincial councils', divided the region into three divisions and appointed three collectors for each to function under the supervision of a Board of Revenue. In 1803 the whole district was put under one collector. Further, in 1796 it revived the Vizianagaram Zamindari proper and restored it to Narayana Raju and reinstated all the hill Zamindars in their hereditary possessions as individual entities. This marked the end of the domination of Vizianagaram; and it was also made an example of the exercise of British power. All the above measures marked a turning point in the history of the district and the history of the relations between the Company and the Zamindars, signifying the beginning of reduction of native elements, elimination of their agency, concentration of power in the British officers and organization of British administration.

The Company, anxious to diminish "the overgrown extent and power" of Vizianagaram and esta-

blish its own reputation for justice, adopted the policy of reinstating several feudatories Vizianagaram, bringing them under its own control. But, in this, it opened the Pandora's box. The restored hill Zamindars were poor and incompetent and lacked prestige. Hence, they could not maintain and manage their Zamindaris and always defaulted. They always suffered from internal intrigues and feuds. They proved a tough problem to the British from 1796 onwards.

In 1802-03 the Company decided to introduce Permanent Settlement for complete consolidation. But owing to extravagance, negligence, consequent degeneration of administration, family feuds for power and succession disputes, there were disorders in the Zamindaris which affected the revenue administration and political situation. Further some of them were refractory; and, aided by a wild, unhealthy and inaccessible 'country' they harassed the British and kept the district in leash for the next thirty years. The Permanent Settlement did not work well and the collectors had still to apply the punitive policies like attachments, auction and sequestration. But they used to restore the Zamindaris after realising arrears and give the Zamindars chance for better administration. However, the Zamindars could not reciprocate and rise to the occasion. The recalcitrant Zamindars were visited with forfeiture.

The Hill Zamindars disregarded the persuasions of the authorities to be regular in payments and even to the attachments, knowing well that they could resist the aumeens. They also took advantage of the decision of the Government not to sell the ancient Zamindaris, indulged in extravagance and the Government found it highly difficult to collect the peshkash. The Zamindari area of the district was still in chaos.

The Government realized that this state "has mainly owed its origin to the weakness of the authority of Government exhibited in nominal attachments which brings the collector into collusion with these Zamindars generally to the defeat of the former has thrown discredit not only on him but on the Government which he represented"³ and to an "entire want of system throughout the district and the absence of any connecting link between the Government and the people in consequence of the want of a properly organized village police and the inefficiency both in weight, respect and influence of the district establishments....."⁴ while the Government was thinking of taking significant steps to restore their general authority which "has lately been very weak", by 1832 the disturbances reached their climax and the Government sent against three of the worst offenders a special commission backed by a strong military force. These developments led to the organisation of a special form of Government, the 'Agency', which occupied most of the district and over which the Collector acting as 'Agent to the Governor' exercised extraordinary powers.

After 1834 the position improved as the Company, who settled and systematized their position and administration in the 'country', realized that the collection of revenue from people 'is only justified by the provisions of public benefits' and that the Permanent Settlement was a failure. They changed their attitude and began to take active interest in the affairs of the Zamindaris to the necessary extent, without entangling themselves in their internal affairs. They educated and trained the minor Zamindars so that they might be good administrators like Bobbili Zamindars, who were an exception to this negative

saga. According to this new and realistic attitude, the British followed the policy of ryotwari system in the Zamindaris that came under their control and began to develop them also, inspiring and evoking responsive action of the other Zamindars who were under the British training. There is no evidence regarding the operation of these new policies and nature of the new trend. But it may be inferred that they emulated the major Zamindars who were becoming benevolent. This facilitated the positive impact of the British administration and development of the district gradually.

Thus the history of the relations between the Company and native aristocracy from 1769 to 1834 was the history of the causes that led to the accumulation of large arrears of jama on the part of the Zamindars on one hand and on the other the efforts of the Company to realize as much revenue from them as possible punctually and consolidate its authority. It was a period of clashes between the new and vigorous British power and the weak but lingering native power elements. In the beginning the British depended on Vizianagaram but as its agency failed they brought the hill Zamindaris under their control and introduced their own systems of revenue as well as general administration. In controlling the hill Zamindaris they had to face great difficulties for four decades and could ultimately bring them under control and normalize the district to establish a constructive administration.

Thus the peaceful trading Company upto 1760's had to follow thereafter political and authoritarian policy coupled with opportunism and expediency and transformed itself into supreme power. The

native aristocracy offered tough resistance; but, unable to withstand the new and vigorous British power gradually became submissive and amenable to their control and influence from 1834 onwards and responded and facilitated the policy of integration and development adopted by the British imperialism in this region also.

REFERENCES

- 1 3 May 1794, V.D.R. (3700 : 68).
- 2 The Fifth Report, Op.cit., Vol. II, p. 22.
- 3 Collector to BOR, 29 October 1838, V. D. R. (6642 : 534).
- 4 Collector to BOR, 16 May 1832, V. D. R. (4744 : 181).

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

MANUSCRIPT SOURCES

English

Vizagapatam District Records: Andhra Pradesh State Archives, Hyderabad, Section 1769-1835, Citation: v. D. R. (Vol. pp.)

Board of Revenue Consultations: Tamilnadu Archives, Madras, 1788-1835, Citation: BORO (Vol. pp.)

Revenue Consultations - Tamilnadu Archives, Madras, 1774-1794, Citation: R. C. (Vol. PP.)

Telugu

Pusapati Vamsavali: Mackenzie Collections, 405-Oriental Manuscript Library, Madras.

Kalinga Purvottaram: Local Records- R. 1092 (Vol. 17)- Andhra Pradesh State Archives, Hyderabad-

Printed Sources

REFERENCE WORKS AND REPORTS

A Collection and Precise of Papers about Jeypore (Madras, 1804) From the 'Selections from the Records of the Madras Government' Series.

Ananda Gajapathi III - Vizianagarm Treaty of November 15, 1758 (Madras, 1894).

Cambridge, Richard Owen: An Account of the War in India Between the English and French on the Coast of Coromandel (London, 1761).

Correspondence Relative to the Permanent Settlement of Zamindaries in the late 2nd division of Vizagapatam (Madras, 1909), From the 'Selections from the Records of the Board of Revenue, 'Land Revenue' series.

Firminger, Walter F (ed) : The Fifth Report from the Select Committee on the Affairs of the East India Company, Vol. II, Madras Presidency (Madras, 1866). Appendix 13: James Grant, 'Political Survey of the Northern Circars', pp. 131-265.

Forrest, G. W. : Bengal and Madras Papers, 3 Volumes (Calcutta, 1928).

Foster, William (ed.) : The English Factories in India, 1618-1669, 13 Volumes (Oxford, 1906-27)

General Reports of the Board of Revenue to the Honorable the Governor in Council sent Home to the Honorable the Court of Directors, 1786-1827, Volumes 1 to 39 (Madras, 1871-1882) Citation : General Reports of BOR (Year Para)

Guide to the Records of the Vizagapatam District : 1769-1835 (Madras, 1934).

Love, Henry Davison : Vestiges of Old Madras (London, 1913) in four volumes.

Maclean, C. D. : Standing Information Regarding the Official Administration of Madras Presidency in Each Department (Madras; 1877)

Madras Presidency - Records of Fort St. George: (Public) Despatches to England 1694/6-1746/51, 11 Volumes. Madras : Records Office, 1919-32

(‘Public’ dropped from the title after the first volume)

Cited as RFSG : DTE

Records of Fort St. George : Diary and Consultations Books 1672/8-1756, 85 Volumes Madras : Records Office, 1910-43, Cited as RFSG : Diary

Records of Fort St. George : Letters from Fort St. George, 1679 1765, 40 Volumes Madras : Records Office, 1915-41, Cited as RFSG : Letters from FSG.

Records of Fort St. George : Letters to Fort St. George, 1681-1765, 45 Volumes, Madras : Records Office, 1915-46, Cited as RFSG : Letter to FSG.

Manual of the Administration of the Madras Presidency (Madras, 1885), in three volumes.

Orme, Robert : A History of the Military Transactions of the British Nation in Indostan (Madras, 1861), in three volumes. Volume One :

Proceedings of the Committee of Circuit in the Vizagapatam and Chicacole Districts. 12 September 1784 (Madras, 1915).

Raghavaiyengar, S. Srinivasa : Memorandum on the Progress of the Madras Presidency during the last forty years of British Administration (Madras, 1893).

Report of the Committee of Circuit on the Cassimcotah Division of the Chicacole Circar, 11 October 1784, Madras, 1914).

Russell, George Edward : Reports on the disturbances in Purla Kimeddy, Vizagapatam and

Goomsoor, in 1832-1836 (Madras, 1856), in two volumes. From the 'Selections from the Records of the Madras Government' Series.

Sinha, H.N. (ed.) : Fort William - India House Correspondence (Public Series), vol. II 1757-1759 (Delhi, 1957).

Wheeler, J. T. : Madras in Olden Times 1639-1727 (Madras, 1861-2) in three volumes.

District Manuals and Gazetteers

Boswell, J. A. C. : A Manual of Nellore District (Madras, 1873)

Carmichael, D. F. : A Manual of the District of Vizagapatam (Madras, 1869).

Francis, W. : District Gazetteer for Vizagapatam (Madras, 1907).

Mackenzie, Gordon : A Manual of the Kistna District (Madras, 1883).

Maltby, Thest James : The Ganjam District Manual (Madras, 1882).

Primary Works

English

Aitchison, C. W. : Treaties, Engagements and Sanads (Calcutta, 1909) in nine volumes.

Auber, Peter : The Rise and Progress of British power in India (London, 1837).

Baden-Powell, B. H. : Land Revenue in British India (Oxford, 1894).

- Briggs, H.G. : The Nizam : His History and Relations with the British Government (London, 1861).
- Chesney, George : Indian Polity (London, 1870)
- Deo, Kumar Bidyadhar Singh : Nandapur (A Forsaken Kingdom, Jeypore, 1938).
- Dodwell, H. : Dupleix and Clive (London, 1920).
- Forde, Colonel Lionel : Lord Clive's Right Hand Man (London, 1910).
- Gribble, J. D. B. : A History of the Deccan (London, 1924).
- Hunter, W. W. : The Imperial Gazetteer of India (Oxford, 1908).
- Martineau, A. : Bussy in the Deccan. Translated by Miss A Cammiade (Pondicherry, 1941).
- Mill, James : The History of British India (London, 1840) Fourth edition by H. H. Wilson.
- Moreland, W. H. (ed.) : Relations of Golconda in the Early Seventeenth Century (London, 1931)
- Sastri, V. L. (ed.) : Encyclopaedia of the Madras Presidency and the Adjacent States (Madras, 1920-21).
- Swetachalapathi Venkata Ranga Rao Bahadur : A Revised and Enlarged Account of the Bobbili Zamindari (Madras, 1907).
- Temple, Richard Carnae (ed.) : The Diaries of Streyndham Master 1675-1680 (London, 1911) in two volumes.

Vadivelu, A. : The Aristocracy of Southern India
(Madras, 190²).

Wheeler, J. T. : Early Records of British India
(London, 1878).

Secondary Works

Birdwood, George : Report on the Old Records of
the India office (London and Calcutta, 1891).

Chaudhuri, S. B. : Civil Disturbances During Bri-
tish Rule in India 1765-1857 (Calcutta, 1955).

Dodwell, H. : Sepoy Recruitment in the Old Madras
Army (Calcutta, 1922).

Forrest, George : The Life of Lord Clive (London,
1918).

Frykenberg, Robert Eric : Guntur District, 1788-
1848 (Oxford, 1965).

Gopal, Sarvepalli : The Permanent Settlement in
Bengal and Its Results (London, 1949).

Kaye, John W. : The Administration of the East
India Company : A History of Indian Progress
(London, 1853).

Majumdar, R.C. : History of the Freedom Move-
ment in India (Calcutta, 1962).

Malleson, G.B. : History of the French in India
(London, 1893).

Malleson, G. B. : Decisive Battles of India (Lon-
don 1883).

Mudaliar, Gnaṇa Sundara, P. K. : Note on the Permanent Settlement (Madras, 1940).

Muir, Ramsay : The Making of British India: 1765-1858 (London, 1915).

Richards, J. F. : Mughal Administration in Golconda (Oxford, 1975).

Rivett - Carnac, S. : The Presidential Armies of India (London, 1890).

Sarojini Regani : Nizam British Relations, 1724-1857, (Hyderabad, 1963).

Sen, S. P. : The French In India : 1763-1816 (Calcutta, 1958).

Thornton, Edward : The History of the British Empire in India (London, 1841) in six volumes.

Venkatarangaiya, M. (ed) : The Freedom Struggle In Andhra Pradesh (Hyderabad, 1965), Vol. I.

Wilks, Mark : Historical Sketches of the South India (Madras, 1860) in three volumes.

Telugu

Donappa, T u m a t i : Andhra Samasthanamulu Sahitya Poshanam

Murti, Kavikondala Venkata Satyanarayana : Visakhmandala Charitramu.

Narayanakavi, Dittakavi : Sree Krishna Ranga-
raya Charitramu

Narasakavi, Chatrati Lakshmi : Padmanabham
Yuddhamu

Sarma, Jagapati Vastavayaraya : Peddapura Samsthana Charitramu.

Sastri, Tanikella Prakasa: Sreemannisanka Vamsamu

Subba Rao, Rallabandi (ed.) : Kalingadesa Charitra.

Surakavi, Adidamu : Ramalingeswara Satakam

Tamma Bhupaldu, Pusapati : Sri Krishna Vijayamu.

ARTICLES :

Murty, Bhogaraju Narayana : 'Kalinga in the First Year of the 19th century A. D.' The Maharajah's College Magazine, Vizianagaram (April 1922), 105-108.

Ramdas, G. : 'A Brief Survey of Nandapur History'. The Maharajah's College Magazine, Vizianagaram (April & July 1925) 61-63.

Seshagiri Rao, B : 'Antiquities of the Vizianagaram Raj' - The Maharajah's College Magazine, Vizianagaram (January 1922) 66-73.

Srinivasachari, C. S. : 'The Historical Material in the Private Diary of Ananda Ranga Pillai (1736-1761)'. Journal of Indian History, XVI (December 1937) 313-326 and XVII (August 1938) 238-39.

Subba Rao, R. : 'Correspondence Between the Hon'ble East India Company and the Kandregula Family in the 18th Century' - Journal of Andhra Historical Research Society, III (October 1928 and January & April 1929) 209-222, IV (July & October 1929) 61-146 and X (1936-1937) 194-208.

'A Note on the Letters of the Hon'ble East India Company, addressed to Rajah Jogi Jagannadharao Bahadur, exhibited at the 12th Session of the Indian Historical Records Commission, XII' (December 1929) 80-81.

'A Manuscript of Value to the History of Orissa'- Indian Historical Records Commission, XXXV (1960) 159-60.

Sundaram, Lanka : 'The Revenue Administration of the Northern Sarkars' - Journal of Andhra Historical Research Society, VI to XV Relevant pages.

'British Beginnings in the Andhradesa'- Triveni Madras (November 1928) 51 - 53.

GLOSSARY¹

H.H. Wilson, Glossary of Judicial and Revenue Terms (Calcutta, 1855) and The Fifth Report, Volume III.

Adalat (U) : A Court of Law.

Agraharam (Tel.) : Village or part thereof held by Brahmans on a quit-rent or free of assessment.

Amani, Amanee (U) : Held in trust. Lands or other sources of revenue held in trust under the direct management of government.

Amin, Ameen (A) : A police and/or revenue officer incharge of one thana/or taluk. A Tahsildar.

Arzi, Arji, Urzee, Arzee (A) : A petition; an address; a memorial; a respectful statement or representation whether oral or written.

Circar (P) : Government, organization, administration, or district, See Sarkar.

Cutcherry : See Kacheri. Kacheri (Mar.), Kachahri (U), Cutcherry : A Court, a hall, an office, the place where any public business is transacted.

Daul, Dowle (Mar.), Davulu, Daulu (Tel.) : Mode, manner, shape appearance, form, estimate, valuation. A statement of particulars of gross revenue levied from an estate or district. An estimate of amount which estate should yield.

Daul-band-o-bast : Detailed estimate.

Diwan, Dewan (P) : A minister; a chief officer; and/or a financial and revenue chief minister.

Dubash, Dubashi, Dubasi (Tel.) : An Interpreter. An Indian in the service of a European. A person who speaks two languages (do-bashi) and revenue chief minister.

Fasli (U) : The harvest year - a mode of computing time in India from July 1st. By adding 590 to the Fasli year, one may gain a rough calculation of the year Anno Domini.

1. Note : Key to abbreviations within brackets as follows :

(A) Arabic
(S) Sanskrit

(U) Urdu and/or Hindustani
(Tel.) Telugu

(P) Persian
(Mar.) Marathi

Faujdar (U. and A) : Army Officer (Fauj : army or military : dar : keeper, holder or official). He was often given charge of all military-criminal matters in a district.

Firman : Order, mandate. An imperial decree, a royal grant or charter.

Havali, Haveli, Hawali (Tel. and A.) : House; habitation; domain; the demesne, or household land of the Sircar, consisting of districts near each capital town, and originally annexed to those towns for the supply of the civil and military establishments. It afterwards came to signify 'any land retained or resumed by the Government and under its management. In Bengal the term is applied to such lands as are held by a Zamindar for his own benefit; but at Madras it designates such as are exempt from the intervention of Zemindars or Jaghiredars, and the revenues of which are either farmed out on short leases, or collected by the Government officials without any other agency.

Hundi (U.) : A bill of exchange.

Inam (A), Inamu (Tel.) : Land which is free from revenue.

Jama (A.) : A 'gathering' or 'collecting'. Amount aggregate, total, - as applied especially to debit or receipt side of an account and the rental of an estate. Also total amount of rent or revenue payable by a cultivator or Zamindar including all cesses, as well as land tax; sometimes only revenue

on land. Usually compounded with another term.
Jamabandi (U.) : The annual settlement made under the ryotwar system.

Kabuliat, Cabooleat (U. and A.) : A written agreement; a counterpart of a revenue lease; deed. 'A written agreement, especially one signifying assent as the counterpart of a revenue lease.... or the document in which a payer of revenue whether to Government or to Zemindar or to Farmer, expresses his consent to pay the amount assessed'. A written contract - the counterpart of a revenue lease or a license.

Kacheri (Mar.), Kachahri (U.), Cutcherry : A court, a hall, an office, the place where any public business is transacted.

Kaifayat, Kyfeeyut (U.) : Statement, description, deposition, report, account of particulars, story. Any authenticated document or voucher.

Kasba (A.), Casuba (Tel.) : A small town or large village, the chief or market town of a district.

Kaul, Kowle, Cowle, Kavulu (Tel.) : A word, a promise, an agreement.

Kistbundy - A contract for the payment of a debt or rent by instalments.

Kist, Kistu, Sistu (Tel.) : Instalment, portion; the amount paid as an instalment to government and the period fixed for its payment. As a revenue term it denotes the portion of the annual assessment paid at specified periods in the course of the year.

Maniam, Manyam' Mannium (Tel.) : Land held free of assessment by village servants as emoluments for service

Milkiat-istemari (U.): Possession in perpetuity.
'Proprietary Right'.

Motarpha, Motarpha (Tel.) Mutarafa (A.): A tax or taxes levied on trades and professions, on village artificers, as on weavers' looms, shops, stalls, and sometimes upon houses. It is properly a poll-tax.

Pagoda: Hindu Temple. Also, the gold coin formerly coined at Madras... from its having the device of a temple on its face ... but called Hun and Varaha by natives. The 'star-pagoda' of Madras was valued at 45 fanamas or roughly three and a half rupees.

Peshkash, Peshkush (U.): Tax, tribute. Lit., 'What is first drawn'. First fruits. In Madras, revenue exacted from the great Zamindars in the Northern Sarkars and from the Poligars of the South.

Polligar: Head of a village district. Military Chieftain in the peninsula similar to hill Zamindar in the Northern Circars.

Rachewar: Related to kings or nobles. A warlike tribe, from which a part of the Zemindars of the Northern Circars are descended.

Rajah: King prince, Chieftain, nobleman. A title in ancient times given to chiefs of the second or military Hindu tribe only.

Raju (Tel.): A high caste of Telugu Cultivators claiming to be Kshatriya (the second or military-regal caste).

Ryotwari: A revenue system in which, theoretically, an agreement is made between government officers and each individual cultivator actually tilling the soil once a year for a money tax.

Samasthanamu (Tel.): Hereditary (Ancient) Hindu fief.

Sanad, Sunnud: A prop or support. A patent, charter or written authority for holding either land or office.

Sarkar, Circar (P.): The State, the Government, Supreme Authority. The Organization, the administration, the management, the department, the province. The 'Northern Circars' were a province comprised of district administration.

Saukar, Sahukar (U. and Mar.): Banker, dealer in money, money lender.

Subah: A province, such as Bengal. A grand division of a country, which is again divided into circars, chucklahs, pergunnahs, and villages.

Subahdar: The viceroy or governor of a province. The title is also used to designate a native military officer, whose rank corresponds with that of a captain.

Taluk: A subdivision of a district.

Zabty, Zaptl, Zafti (U.): Sequestrated, attached; applied to lands taken possession of by the Government officers, or to rent-free lands which have been subjected to assessment.

Zamindar (P.) : A land-(Zamin) holder (dar). An officer who, under the Muhammadan government was charged with the superintendence of the lands of a district, financially considered, the protection of the cultivators, and the realization of the government's share of its produce, either in money or kind; out of which he was allowed a commission amounting to about ten per cent, and, occasionally a special grant of the governments share of the produce of the land of a certain number of villages for his subsistence;... the appointment was occasionally renewed; and as it was generally continued in the same person, so, long as he conducted himself to the satisfaction of the ruling power and even continued to his heirs; so, in process of time, and through the decay of that power, and the confusion which ensued, hereditary right (at best prescriptive) was claimed and tacitly acknowledged; till, at length, the Zamindars of Bengal in particular from being the mere superintendents of the land, have been declared the hereditary proprietors of the soil, and the before fluctuating dues of government have, under a permanent settlement, been unalterable fixed in perpetuity.

Zillah, Jillah, Zila : A division or district. A (A and Tel.) Collectorate.

INDEX

- Abdullah Qutb Shah, 13
 Agency System, 72
 Alexander, 59, 60
 Andra, 4, 9, 43, 54, 57,
 60, 61, 87, 90, 196, 215
 Andrews, John, 19, 20,
 36, 171, 181
 Arzee Beg, 129, 130, 131
 Aurangabad treaty, 17, 18
 Aurangazeb, 5
 Board of Revenue, 45, 47,
 50, 51, 55, 58, 59, 68, 70,
 103-106,
 112-114, 133, 154, 155, 178,
 213, 231-32
 Bobbili, 7, 9, 19, 35, 42,
 54, 57, 58, 61, 72, 85,
 200-202, 213-14, 217, 219;
 Vengal Rao, 201; Chinna
 Ranga Rao, 201-203;
 Royadappa, 202-203;
 Swetachalapati, 203
 Browne, Richard, 14
 Bussy, 7, 19, 201, 214
 Carmichael, 82, 181
 Chamier, John, 47
 Chandurti, 20
 Chemudu, 9, 54, 56, 58, 60,
 61, 72, 87, 196
 Chicacole, 2, 5-8, 10, 14,
 15, 21, 22, 25, 33-36, 38,
 39, 41, 58, 60, 82-85, 89-90
 94, 98, 99, 138-141, 159,
 171, 200
 Clive, Robert, 19, 24, 86
 Committee of Circuit,
 37, 38, 40-44, 94, 96,
 97, 99, 131, 147, 173,
 182, 196, 231
 Colonel Braithwaite, 40
 Colonel Forde, 19, 21,
 128
 Colonel Prendergast,
 48, 102, 103, 108-109
 Cotsford, Edward, 34-36,
 82
 Dubois, 14
 Golconda, 2, 4, 8, 9, 42,
 43, 54, 57, 58, 60, 61, 70,
 72, 87, 180, 181, 184, 186,
 203;
 Virabhupati, 181
 Bhairava Bhupati, 182
 Malla Bhupati, 182, 183
 Krishna Bhupati, 183
 Ananta Bhupati, 183-186
 Grant, James, 82
 Gregory, Arthur William,
 47, 154
 Holcombe, 17
 Hussain Ali Khan, 23, 24,
 33, 34, 89
 Jeypore, 1, 2, 4, 8-9, 51-52,
 56, 58, 60-61, 72, 91, 127,
 171, 180-81, 184, 195-97,
 199, 203, 206, 208-209,
 211, 214, 218-219, 226;
 Visvambara Deo I, 171,
 208, 211, 218, 220; Vikr-
 ama Deo I 90, 91, 195-97;
 Ramachandra Deo II,

51, 52, 197-199, 204, 206, Chandrasekhara Raju, 209, 210; Jagannadha
 Vikrama Deo II, 198, 199 Raju, 208-210
 Jogi Pantulu, Kandregula, 23, 34 Munro, Sir Thomas, 66, 180
 Kasimkota, 5, 36, 41, 44, 50, 55, 150 Murray, Leveston Gran-
 Kimidi (Barla Kimidi), 184-185 ville Keith, 61
 8-10, 25, 34, 44, 45, 55, Nizam Ali, 21-25, 35
 60, 61, 88, 90, 127, 129, Nizam-ul-Mulk, 5, 7
 130, 134-135, 140, 141, Pachipenta, 9, 54, 58, 60,
 144, 149, 211: 61, 72, 87, 196, 219, 221;
 Narayana Deo, 25, 34, 35, Virapa Raju, 220; Mallapa-
 36, 90, 127-129; Gajapati Raju, 240; Mallapa Raju,
 Deo, 35, 128-135, 137, 189, 220
 141-143, 149; Jagannadha Padmanabham; 26, 44, 50,
 Deo, 129-132, 134, 136, 107-110, 174, 205, 218
 140-143, 149; Purusho- Palakonda, 2, 4, 8, 9, 42,
 ttama Deo, 139, 141-43, 53, 54, 57, 58, 60-61, 68,
 Kurupam, 8-9, 42, 54, 58, 71, 72, 87, 90, 171-174;
 60-61, 72, 87, 196, 208, 210, 186, 200, 210, 214,
 211; Sivarama Raju, 211; Ramabhadra Raju, 172;
 Sanyasi Raju, 212; Sita Vijayarama Raju, 172-174,
 rama Raju, 212-213, 176, 180, 214;
 Madugula, 8, 42, 54, 56, Sitarama Raju, 175
 58, 60, 61, 72, 87, 90, Venkatapati Raju, 175
 128, 180, 203-206, 208, 176, 180
 Linga Bhupati, Payaka Row, 40
 203-204, 207; Krishna Permanent Settlement,
 Bhupati; 204, 207, 208, 9, 49, 58, 59, 61-64, 66
 Appala Bhupati, 204, 206, 67, 70, 111, 143, 175
 Jagannadha Bhupati, 183, 209, 212, 216, 220,
 205-208, Pigot, 38
 Martial Law, 69, 71 Pusapati Family, 3, 7, 9
 Masulipatam, 13, 19, 26, 33, 36, 51, 82-84, 86,
 21-24, 26, 33, 44, 86, 98, 89, 100, 110, 114, 116,
 105, 107, 108, 128, 139, 135, 198, 230;
 196, 199 Ananda Raju, 7, 19, 20,
 Merangi, 8, 54, 56, 58, 21, 85, 86, 201, 205, 230;
 60, 61, 72, 208, 210; Vijayarama Raju I, 7, 15,
 Ganga Raju, 208, 210, 18, 82, 84, 85, 116, 171,
 212; 196, 214;

- Vijayarama Raju II, 10, 22, 34, 38-40, 43-48, 63, 69, 87, 88, 92, 97, 99-102, 104-107, 110, 174, 181, 196, 201, 204, 208, 211, 212, 215, 220; Sitarama Raju, 4, 22-24, 26, 34, 35, 38, 40, 46, 47, 87-103, 110, 128, 129, 172-174, 182, 196, 197, 201, 211, 214, 218-220; Narayana Raju, 50, 51, 53-56, 68, 110, 116, 174, 176, 215, 216; Rajahmundry, 22-26, 33, 86, 89, 185, 201; Ramsden, George, 13, 14; Rumbold, Sir Thomas, 38-40, 95-97, 129; Russell, George, 68, 70, 71, 176, 179, 180, 210, 219; Salabat Jang, 5, 7, 19, 21, 22, 87, 196; Salur, 8, 9, 41, 42, 54, 58, 60, 61, 87, 196, 200, 218; Sanyasi Raju, 218; Ramachandra Raju, 218-219; Chandrasekhara Raju, 218-219; Sangamvalasa, 8, 9, 54, 56, 58, 60, 61, 72, 87, 216; Venkanna, 216; Peddanna, 216, 217; Gangamma, 216, 217; Seetamma, 217; Shake Mahomed, 130; Sher Muhammad Khan, 6, 9, 82, 200; Smith, John, 114; Snow, John, 47, 50, 133; Srungavarapukota, 214; Kasipati Raju 214; Rayabhupala Raju, 214-216; Virabhadra Raju, 216; Stables, John, 14; Stratton, George, 38; Tekkali, 8, 10, 43, 45, 55, 60, 61, 91, 140, 143-147, 149, 150-152, 153, 154, 157; Jagannadha Jagga Deo, 143-148; Ramakrishna Jagga Deo, 148, 157, 159; Vizagapatam, 1, 2, 5, 20, 35, 47, 101, 102, 107, 109, 132-134, 141, 145, 150, 153, 154, 157, 175, 185, 195, 211, 230; Factory, 13-17, 19, 83, 86, 91; Chief and Council, 18, 33, 36, 39, 48, 50, 100, 103, 129, 130, 131, 135, 146, 147, 171, 172, 205; District 1, 41, 60, 61, 82, 102, 110, 132, 140, 152, 200, 201, 209, 230; Region, 6, 26; Vizianagaram; Family, 22-24, 26, 34, 35, 82, 87, 99; Fort, 15, 40, 84, 85, 94, 103; Treaty, 86; Zamindari, 4-10, 26, 36, 38-42, 46, 50, 53-58, 60-61, 68, 70, 72, 82, 85-86, 88, 91-92, 94, 95, 97-98, 100, 103, 104, 110, 111, 114, 116, 131, 156, 171, 173, 176, 179, 181-183, 195-198, 200-204, 208, 211, 214-16, 230-231; Webb, Nathaniel, 50, 51, 3, 55-57, 60, 183, 198, 202, 216.

ERRATA

Page	Line	For	Read
4	32	Vizianagara	Vijayanagara
9	7	famiy	family
14	29	we	were
21	5	17 9	1759
22	26	supergsedin	superseding
33	1	17 6	1766
36	11	ffrst	first
40	33	'de facto'	delete the word
42	21	rnder	render
45	24	787	1787
51	10	profered	proffered
52	18	loyalty	loyalty
53	13	to	of
54	12	Andhra	Andra
71	27	Frederiek	Frederick
73	22	hostilitics	hostilities
82	28	conntry	country
105	15	attaiment	attainment
111	26	181	1814
111	32	and 'Maniams'	and gave 'Maniams'
128	3	759	1759
145	11	Rs. 0,000	Rs. 30,000
145	24	178	1782
200	32	17 3	1753
217	6	1890	1820
218	15	197	1793
232	11	instad	instead
235	12	influnce	influence